

Sergey Kremlev
Political history of the First World War

August 1914. All about the First World War -



Kremlev S. Political history of the First World War
M.: Algorithm, 2014. - 500 p.

annotation

Without knowing how and why the First World War was conceived, how it began, continued and ended, it is impossible to understand what is happening in the world today. At the same time, the political history of the First World War is interesting and instructive in itself.

Sergey Kremlev restores the secret background of what happened in front of hundreds million people, and shows what forces moved the world on the eve of the 20th century and in its at the beginning, why did the First World War take place, who prepared it and why? He opens the technology by which Russians and Germans were pitted against each other for the first time. This clash, unnecessary for Russia or Germany, was organized by the "Golden International" of financiers in the interests of America's future world domination.

Among the historical figures present on the pages of the book are emperors Nicholas II and Wilhelm II, public politicians Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Bismarck, US President Wilson, "behind the scenes" figures: "grey reverend" of the German Foreign Ministry Baron Holstein, international arms dealer Basil Zakharov, "grey colonel" from USA Mandel House, as well as: British Foreign Minister Sir Edward Grey, financiers Witte and the Rothschilds, Russian military agent in Scandinavia and Paris Count Ignatiev, head of the Jewish community of St. Petersburg - stoker of the guards barracks, sergeant major Oshansky, and many others ...

A new, and at the same time fascinating, look at the prehistory, history and "after the history" of the old war is the essence of Sergei Kremlev's book.

Sergei Kremlev

World War I: a new look at the old war

*Europe should always look open to America
eyes and not give any pretext for accusations or reprisals.*

*America is getting stronger every day. She will turn into
great force, and the moment will come when, in the face of Europe,
communication with which will become easier as a result of new
discoveries, she will wish to have a say in our affairs
and put your hand on them.*

*Political caution would then require
governments of the old continent scrupulous monitoring of
so that no pretext for such
intervention.*

*The day America comes to Europe, peace and security
will be expelled from it for a long
time." **Charles Maurice Talleyrand, late 18th century***

Author's preface

Dear reader! 2014 is

the year of the 100th anniversary of the start of the First World War. On this occasion scientific monographs are published, many speeches are made, special television programs and films that claim to be documentaries ... And now and then they talk about the "forgotten" "Great" war, which was allegedly hushed up by the anti-patriotic villains Bolsheviks ... With "patriotic" leavened foam at the mouth they tell that this war was once called the "Second Patriotic War", meaning that the first was the war with Napoleon.

However, behind all these streams of words, it is almost impossible to hear a simple the truth about that war. And the truth is that the First World War was conceived by the world Golden International in the interests of America, served the interests America and one of its general goals had the goal of playing off and mutual the weakening of Russia and Germany, that is, those two powers whose peaceful partnership ruled out America's global dominance.

At the same time, America feared Russia even more than Germany in the future. Germany by the beginning of the First World War was America's competitor in real terms time, we'll see. Russia, with its huge potential, was a danger for America in the future. Actually, by the 50s of the 20th century, this was exactly what happened. Therefore, in In a sense, World War I can be seen as America's war against the future of Russia...

Yes, this is an unusual look at that war, but this is a truthful look, dear reader!

The truth about those days lies in the fact that the war between Russia and Germany was not for Russia. necessary, it could have been avoided. And although during this war the Russian soldier showed himself often as a hero and a skilled warrior, his exploits were historically meaningless: not for Russia and not for the interests of its peoples, he shed his blood from the autumn of 1914 to the autumn of 1917 of the year...

Since the development and analysis of this plot of world history, I at one time - at the end last century - began his work in the field of historical research. The result was

the publication at the beginning of the new century, in 2003, of my first book "Russia and Germany: play off! (From Wilhelm's Versailles to Wilson's Versailles). It was

followed by two other purely historical works "Russia and Germany - together or apart?", "Russia and Germany: the path to the Pact", then - "Kremlin visit
Führer" with the last virtual chapter and later - even more virtual "If only
Hitler did not attack the USSR. However, even the last book is not fiction, but a special type
historical research.

Now I bring to the attention of the reader a new, supplemented and revised
publication of his first "Germanic" book. After all, since the first edition has passed
more than ten years, and this "test of the pen" needed a deep, even purely stylistic
editing. Not to mention the fact that over the past ten years it has greatly deepened and expanded
my understanding of the new and recent history of the world and Russia ...

Actually, the plans were to write on the material of the old book a more thorough
coverage of the facts and events of the work about the First World War, which became the first, in fact, the war
Russians and Germans. Unfortunately, a lot of work on a book about V. I. Lenin took away from me those
strength and the time that I intended to spend on the "Russian-German" theme. However,
what is offered to the reader is in many ways a new book. In

addition, as they say, "a spoon for dinner is expensive" ... And I hope that against the background
the growing falsification of the prehistory, history and posthistory of the First World
war in the year of its 100th anniversary, the publication of such a book will be all the more appropriate and
necessary that the first recent conflict between Russians and Germans is mutually meaningless
and provoked by hostile forces - turned out to be in a systemic sense closely connected with
their second conflict, which will be briefly discussed below ...

In the 20th century, Russians and Germans could and should have peacefully cooperated, mutually
complementing their creative efforts.

And they fought each other twice. And for
what?

ON ONE rainy day in the fall of 1997, I once again thought about the long
question that interested me: "How inevitable was the clash between the USSR and
Germany?" In a deadly confrontation between two great powers and peoples, Germany
lost. But Russia, as it turned out, won the victory in the historical perspective.
Pyrrhic And she became such not least because in the first half
the forties, the Soviet Union had to engage in labor not peaceful, but military.

By 1941, our social prospects were, without exaggeration, grandiose. If the third five-year plan in
1942 had been completed as planned, and
the opportunity to fulfill the fourth five-year plan by 1947, then by the beginning of the fifties
years, the astonished world would see with its own eyes, which even in such a backward country in the past as
Russia, can reach the people working not for the parasitic and semi-parasitic
elite, not on the financial and industrial structures of the Golden International, but on themselves.

Economic progress would ensure the well-being of the peoples of Russia, in life
new generations would be firmly established, qualitatively differently educated in comparison with
fathers and grandfathers, qualitatively more cultured. And for prosperity, education and culture
socialist democratization would have come as an expansion of opportunities for a broad
masses to control their own destiny. June

22, 1941 changed everything for both Russia and Germany, ending on May 9, 1945. Then Russia
won. And although Germany has now gone far beyond its former
winner, in a historical perspective, the Germans also missed their historical
chance! After all, if not for the last "Drang nach Osten", Germany could be today (and according to
right!) the second power in the world - after the USSR.

The conflict was mutually meaningless, but was it automatically programmed
confrontation between the communist USSR and the nationalist Third Reich?

At first glance, the affirmative answer is obvious. Let's say the future Marshal Soviet Union Boris Mikhailovich Shaposhnikov, even when he was his commander troops of the Leningrad, and then the Moscow districts, published in 1927-1929 the famous three-volume work "The Brain of the Army", which said: "Great wars are like earthquake ... This experienced "earthquake", unfortunately, has not yet ... imperialism of its anaconda hugs that suffocate humanity ... A series of wars, wars fierce, because the contradictions that exist between the capitalist form of the world economy and the emerging new economic structure, are so great that it is impossible to do without great sacrifices and struggle.

Accordingly, the USSR was preparing for war, like other powers, like Germany. AND very many believed that it was these two countries that would have to face in the future again. They say that "ideology" programs everything

here ... But here is the opinion of the Japanese Sovietologist Professor Teratani: "By the conclusion of the Soviet-German treaty, the idea of a world revolution faded into the background. Trotsky brought his theory of "permanent revolution". Stalin ended this romance. With him, then exists in the 1930s, there was a certain de-ideologization of Soviet foreign policy.

Professor Teratani rightly believed that Stalin gave priority to ensuring sovereignty of the USSR. In other words, the ideological guidelines of the USSR were oriented towards war, and from this point of view it became indeed inevitable. However, directly state interests were oriented towards peace... And this

circumstance alone makes everything not so obvious! True, Teratani himself wrote: "It is often possible to come across the assertion that Bolshevism and Nazism are one and the same. I strongly disagree with this. Nazism and Bolshevism - genetic enemies. Seems

to be right? Yes, if you mean ideology. But is it true in general? wondering this question, I by no means join those falsifiers of history who they are trying to convince us that Stalin and Hitler are related phenomena. Kinship - none ideological or spiritual - was not in sight. But something that can reconcile and to push to search for common *state* interests, perhaps, was ...

The same Teratani - unlike many current Russian defrocks with scientists degrees in "Marxist history" - admits that by the end of the thirties, Stalin's The USSR put itself at the forefront, and not Trotsky's chimeras. Why, and Lenin, let's say in brackets, in his recent work worried about how we should "organize the competition", how "to reorganize the Rabkrin", and not about how to kindle a "global fire".

That is, Stalin's Bolshevism had an increasingly pronounced state and even, I would say, a national character. Only the national coloring here was not pure Russian, and the new one is

Soviet. On the thesis of the "Soviet people" as a new historical community of people now laugh. But the idea that at the beginning of the 20th century a new nation began to take shape in Russia - the Russian one, was already expressed by General Denikin in the Notes of a Russian Officer, published before First World War. In the USSR, this trend, subtly noticed by Anton Ivanovich, only developed and strengthened. And Bolshevism of the Stalinist formation increasingly put the interests of the new Soviet-Russian nation are above all else. At the same time, the interests of the Soviet people did not conflict with the interests of other peoples of the world, but were at the forefront boundary of genuine, that is, creative and just, interests of mankind.

German Nazism, however, put the interests of the German nation above all else, and only German nation. The look is arrogant and unconstructive, what can we deny! However the highest interests of both nations - both the Soviet-Russian and the German - consisted in ensuring mutual friendship and cooperation, which had both a natural economic basis, and deep historical roots. And on the basis of commonality national interests of the USSR and Germany did not necessarily have to converge on hand-to-hand.

PROFESSOR Teratani was not so seriously mistaken: Nazism and Bolshevism as ideologies were indeed deeply genetically alien to each other, up to direct antagonism.

But this did not mean that the Nazi Third were the same genetic enemies. Reich, as the state of the German people, and the socialist Soviet Union, as state of the Soviet people. Two states, German and Russian, historically and geopolitically, they were not initially enemies. In a systemic sense, Germany and Russia were designed not to destroy, but to complement each other. And yet they are short the historical period was fought twice cruel wars. What's the matter? Why?

Let me remind you that at first I was interested in the circumstances and origins of the formation conflict between Germany and the USSR. But, examining them in detail, I had to lower myself on the time scale deep into the times, because the origins were found there: from the beginning of the thirties years - to the post-Versailles Weimar Germany and the semi-Trotskyist USSR began twenties, then - to the Treaty of Versailles, the First World War and - to its prehistory. Not understanding how the two peoples were pitted, there was really nothing in the essence of the First World War cannot be understood. And only after the background, history and post-history of that old The war lay down on paper, I realized that the nerve of the situation I had groped right. I hope that after reading the book, the reader will agree with me. Its main idea is clear: the First World War (as well as the Second World War) was conceived and provided by World Gold. The ruling exploiting elites of the world are not simply the main, but the only cause of both great wars of the 20th century. At the same time, plunging into passions that had long since died down, but still not obsolete, I came to thoughts about the artificiality of the participation of pre-revolutionary Russia in the war of the Western world with Germany. We

shouldn't have fought with her ... We didn't need it from any point of view, unless, of course, we have in mind the point of view of a friend of Russia, and not her ill-wisher.

Exploring the problem of "Germans - Russian Slavs", one could get to the times of the late Roman Empire and even more ancient - Vedic, Aryan. And going mentally along this path, far from being rich in mutual conflicts, one can recall that For example, Ivan the Terrible waged a Livonian war not with the Germans, but with *the Swedes* . , What's on

then under the rule of *Lithuania* that, Alexander Nevsky received his nickname for the Neva the victory of 1240 not over the German "dog-knights", but over *the Swedish* army led by a relative of *the Swedish* king Birger.

Yes, and the Battle of the Ice, although it happened two years later in a collision with the Teutonic order, was not a purely bilateral conflict. Order troops (no matter what the order also called German) were actually *international* (Germans, Danes, volunteer knights from other European countries, Chud-Ests).

The first edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia in the first volume for 1926 calls among the enemies of Nevsky, the Swedes, Livonians, Lithuanians, and does not even mention the Germans. Himself The Teutonic Order appeared in the Baltic at the invitation of *the Polish* prince Konrad Mazowiecki and settled there by the will of *the Catholic rulers of the West* to fight against Lithuanian pagan Slavs. Yes, they oriented the Teutonic knights and Orthodox Russia, but *knights* , not the Germans as such.

But in 1940, in the same first edition of the TSB, but already in volume 45 Battle on the Ice was described with an emphasis "on the Germans" ... I think it was not Stalin or Russia's friends who signed the printing an encyclopedic article with a similar focus. What was the matter then? I think that not only in 1914, but also in 1940, those who want to provoke and it was enough to pit two peoples in a deadly battle ...

WE REMEMBER about the victories of the Russian miracle heroes at Yegersdorf and Kunersdorf over Prussian army in the Seven Years' War, that in 1760 the Russians reached Berlin for the first time (occupying it, however, only for three days). But we do not remember well that the seven-year-old the war began because of the colonial quarrels of England and France, and then in this absolutely Russia's unnecessary war was drawn in by the Austrian Empress Maria Theresa in her own interests. She deftly used Elizabeth Petrovna's personal grudge against the Prussian Friedrich.

The conflict between Prussia and Russia was beneficial only to Austria, France, England and Sweden. The famous memoirist of those times Andrei Bolotov (himself a participant in the Seven Years' War) wrote: " Secret alliances with the Saxon elector, who was then together with the king of Poland, also with the king of France and with Sweden itself. All possible means were used to conclude such a but the union with Russia and her inclination to the fact that she, too, would be woven into this conceived and before nothing to do with her."

Yes, since Russia has become a European and world factor, it has been tried "weave" and "weave" into adventures alien to her more than once. And talking about it would be superfluous, but such time travel would take us too far away from the problems recent and current. So I stopped in the Hall of Mirrors of Versailles at the end seventies of the century before last and, admiring the gold of uniforms and the radiance diamond necklace, set off on his return journey. And why did I begin to "dance" precisely from Versailles palace mirrors, the reader will soon find out ... Taking on a

reassessment of the latest relations between Russians and Germans XX century and at the beginning of the XX century, I did not go from personal likes and dislikes, did not build in advance of schemes and did not want to proceed from someone else's constructions. I didn't follow established schemes, however, he did not ignore them, but critically rethought them. And at he tried to leave that which made it possible to reveal historical truth, and not to correct it in some predetermined spirit: "communist-official", nationalist, pro-Western or anti-Soviet. Not striving for the laurels of excessively (and sometimes *maliciously*) fictionalizing

history
Valentina Pikulya, I wanted to achieve lightness, but not lightness of perception by the reader serious facts and assessments.

The first "whale" on which my approach rested was a critical analysis pre-revolutionary, Soviet, post-Soviet and Western sources.

The second "whale" was the confidence in the commonality of human manifestations in any era. To understand how true this or that written historical evidence of this or that epoch, it is useful and even necessary to imagine oneself in this epoch, in its place heroes - and heroes without quotes, and "heroes" in quotes. And

the honesty of the approach was chosen as the third "whale". I didn't want to give some new "version" of ancient events, but tried to carry out the reconstruction closest to what was in fact. That is, to restore the background of what was happening in front of hundreds of millions people...

When the framework of my ideas about those times was outlined, I made it a rule not to afraid to test it for strength over and over again, comparing what I did with what others did before me. And, in my opinion, the "building" that I propose to enter reader, is not built on sand.

By the way, in the twenties, on the same topic, taking exactly the same time frames, he wrote his book "Europe in the era of imperialism. 1871–1919" Academician E. V. Tarle. To be honest, I learned about it after the first version of my book was ready, and, having studied the work of Evgeny Viktorovich, I was glad that I read it after, and not before, writing my own book.

"Versailles..." Tarle's book is superb in fact and, as always with him, brilliant. However, historically it is not well-founded, and why I evaluate it this way, the reader will become,

I hope it's clear when reading my book.

Various historians and authors have lied or kept silent about certain significant circumstances differently. On the views and readiness for the accuracy of "historians" in the service The "renegade" Central Committee of the CPSU was influenced by some factors, the positions of Western historians by others ... Memoirists were often even more biased than historians, and if they were honest they, then the editors of their memoirs were engaged in correcting the real story. In post-Soviet times in the Russian information spaces began to scour the very inveterate liars, opportunists and "historians" - defrocked. They still rule the ball today ... But even among the lies, a solid, reliable truth can come across. find in these blockages created jointly by East and West, not sham, but real "bricks" of events, facts and reasons, it was not easy, but I tried, reader.

I REPEAT: without knowing how and why the First World War was conceived, how it began, continued and ended, it is impossible to understand what thought about how the Second World War began, nor what is happening in the world today. However, the history of the First World War is interesting and instructive in itself.

It is instructive in that it well reveals the technology by which in the 20th century Russians and the Germans were pushed head-on at first for the first time, and then for the second time.

Will they push us into the third one? The question is not idle. Destroyed from without and from within the outside world can take today's Russia, it would seem, with bare hands.

That's how they take us. However, can we be taken with armed hands? To this day, it is unlikely, because if the peoples of Russia find themselves on the brink of *apparent* destruction, they will, as of old, bristle, perhaps, with needles of resistance. Accordingly, for Russia, which has realized itself as sovereign and independent power, confrontation with the outside world is inevitable.

But what position of Germany in relation to Russia will be in the interests of the German people? Is a new confrontation with Russia beneficial for Germany? We need to think about it today so that our tomorrow is smarter and prudent than the pose— and the day before yesterday.

Solzhenitsyn also wrote about the First World War ... An original historian and publicist Nikolai Nikolayevich Yakovlev rated Solzhenitsyn's novel "August the Fourteenth" as a book imbued with "Smerdyakov's" longing that, they say, a "smart nation" (that is, the Germans) did not subdue a "very stupid" nation (that is, us) ... Not badly rated, although Smerdyakov said, in fact, about the French: "It would be nice if these same Frenchmen conquered us then: a smart nation would conquer a very stupid one and join it. They would even be other orders...

Nevertheless, Yakovlev was both right and wrong ... Fairly rejecting Solzhenitsyn's "Smerdyakov" concept, he did not see the benevolence of the idea of the significance of Germany for Russia. Not the conquest of the Russians - the nation socially very inexperienced and inept - the Germans, that is, the nation is really more organized and businesslike, and mutually beneficial *peaceful* ties - that's what would be justified and politically, and economically, and civilizationally then, and what is justified and necessary - with certain adjustments - and now.

The above should not be assessed as cringing before Germany, as preaching our inferiority. In my opinion, the only way to think is not just a Russian person who loves his Motherland, but a person who is aware of the history of Russians and Germans ... In March 1918, at the VII Congress of the Party, Lenin said: -

The last war gave a bitter, painful, but serious science to the Russian people - to organize, be disciplined, obey, create such discipline that she was a model. Learn from the German his discipline, otherwise we are a lost people and forever we will be in bondage...

In such a statement of Lenin there was no sense of civilizational inferiority Russia, but there was a sober understanding of those *historically* (since the time of the damned Tatar-Mongol yoke) the existing vices of the national Russian character, to get rid of which it would be most simple for us in an alliance with only one "external" people - the German. And then Lenin uttered the following words, once again attesting to him as deeply Russian patriot: - When

the time for renewal comes, everyone will feel it, they will see that the Russian a person is not a fool ... One must be able to work on a new path ...

How differently the world of the 20th century could have developed if Russians and Germans everywhere throughout this century, since its beginning, have worked together on the path of creation.

And this would have been possible if not for external incitement, not for stupidity. Russian "leaders", starting with Tsar Nicholas... In the midst

of our first tragic conflict with Germany - October 4, 1917 - the German Thomas Mann wrote to the German Professor Witkop: "And how I love everything Russian! How rejoices me in his antithesis to everything French and his contempt for it, with which meet in Russian literature at every step! How much closer to each other Russian and German humanity! My long-term sincere desire is consent and union with Russia"...

That's it.

I ended my 2003 foreword with this: "It remains to say the last thing ... I did not try to tie all the ends in this book - rather, a series of "memory knots" are tied here. In the subtitle of the title, I wrote "New a look at the old war", but one could also write "a direct look, an unbiased one".

And, of course, I wanted to introduce you, dear reader, to such a look, to convince you that you are right. But first of all, I wanted to write not only a book that is accurate and rigorous from a factual point of view, and to write an interesting book. I tried, reader. And what came of it, you be the judge." In 2014, I'll add that it didn't turn out so bad then - the first pancake turned out to be not a lump at all. The book was received with interest, and the first printing was followed by two additional...

But this once again proves the need for its re-release after revision, because today, hearing and reading what they say and write about the First World War, involuntarily remember the bitter maxim: "The best lie is the truth."

Behind the mountains of formally accurate information, statistics, behind the kilometers of the then Newsreels hide the fact that the First World War was the first truly mass A world massacre organized by the young world imperialism... What is this war quickly lost the veil of heroism, and for Russia and Germany, this war was completely meaningless.

Today, however, a correction has to be made. Ten years ago, when Russia was not yet as deeply involved in the crisis as it is now, I wrote that the main of our wars with the Germans should be the conclusion that in the external in the world, we can have only one reasonable partner - Germany ... Alas,

Germany again behaves in a not the most reasonable way (about Russia in the format Putin is not a conversation at all), but a reasonable national feeling is waking up in France self-preservation, expressed in "lepenism" ... We must not allow new historical conflict between French and Germans. At the same time, the optimal The Europe of the future can only be built on the basis of a triple partnership between Russia, Germany and France.

Yes, Russia can and must become the leader of the new Europe, but only the new Russia, which has thrown off the oligarchy, liberalism and "Yegezh" Putinism, that is Socialist Russia, once again uniting the peoples of the Russian geopolitical space.

Such and only such a Russia will be able to correct the mistakes of the past and make Germany its strategic partner in working for the benefit of Europe and the whole world.

***Sergey Kremlev (Sergey Brezkun),
June 10, 2014.***

Part one. From the sedan disaster to the Parisian conferences

Chapter 1

The era between the two world wars, like our era, cannot be understood without knowing and not understanding what the First World War arose from. And there

are a number of key questions here... Was the war being prepared?

If prepared, then by whom, how and why?

How inevitable was it? And how did

the main world and European events proceed, which she preceded? By the

way, even in those times when everything happened, before these questions serious European historians gave in. The French professor Debidour is his most famous work "The History of European Diplomacy", finished in 1891 as follows: "We can to hope (without falling into a utopia) that the most devastating wars of conquest, the causes of which are almost always the ambition of some dynasty or the thoughtless impulse of any people, will become more and more rare in Europe.

Everything here was a mistake: both the explanation of the reasons, and the very prediction of the course of events. A quarter of a century after Debidur's forecast, in the very center of Europe, it was precisely a devastating war of conquest with the participation of the professor's compatriots. But where and when did it start? To the

question "When did it end?" easier to answer. It finally ended June 28, 1919 in France, at Versailles, when the signatures under the main a document that records the results of the First World War.

What if we go back in time? Then, sorting through the past year after year, you can see that the First world in the same place - in Versailles. In any case, in Versailles in the second half of the XIX century the countdown began to prepare the conditions for such a European war, in the slightest comparison with which did not go even the Napoleonic wars.

VERSAILLES is a former village, later a small town eighteen kilometers from Paris. Louis XIV arranged his brilliant residence in it, and since then Since then, Versailles has entered not only the court chronicles, but also the history of diplomacy. In 1763 - six years before the birth of Napoleon - the Republic of Genoa handed over here France Corsica. In 1783, the Treaty of Versailles established the independence of the United States. In the light of future distant events, the detail is symbolic.

Everyone has heard about the beauty of the fountains of Versailles. Less well known is that in order to The Sun King could admire the brilliance of the water jets, here at first both gold and blood flowed like a river. For the construction of a water pipeline for the Versailles cascades, the royal treasury for three years spent nine million livres. Thirty thousand soldiers and masons employed in construction, there were only lives. Life and had to pay for the royal the pleasure of ten thousand of them. And the entire Versailles complex cost the people France with half a billion livres.

The sum total of the human sacrifices suffered by France to create the beauties of Versailles, eluded historians. Versailles

has been a symbol of eternal festivity for centuries, but its *true* symbolic essence is different: behind the external golden brilliance for hundreds of the elect, there is poverty, suffering and death of hundreds of millions of those who created this brilliance. By the second half of the

nineteenth century, many great events. Here the French monarchy reached the peak of its power under

Louis XIV, from here King Louis XVI and Queen Marie Antoinette set off on a journey that ended for them on the guillotine.

Here the Emperor of the French Napoleon passed with short steps, and here flaunted - much later - his nephew, Emperor Napoleon III. Second empire the third Napoleon ended with the surrender of the French army at Sedan in during the Franco-Prussian War.

ABOUT THIS OLD WAR, which was of epochal significance not only for both countries - its participants, but also for the rest of the big world, they always wrote in the Soviet Union indistinct. It did not come to direct falsifications, however, the angles of the presentation of the era were seriously shifted.

What's the matter here? Perhaps in the fact that one of the results of the war was at the beginning formation and then fall of the Paris Commune. And the involvement of Prussia, Bismarck, Moltke in the defeat of the Commune programmed a negative attitude towards the victory of the Germans in works of Soviet historians. The

"historians of the Central Committee of the CPSU" came out so that the gloomy, militant, militaristic, bloodthirsty and aggressive Prussia, wanting to quickly complete the program unification of Germany "with iron and blood", invaded the sunny and cheerful France, brutally suppressed it, took away from it the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine and robbed defeated French, imposing on them an indemnity of 5 billion francs.

Bismarck was generally accused of forgery. He allegedly provoked the war by crossing out a few significant phrases from the so-called "Ems Dispatch", before transmitting it for printing.

With such a scheme in front of my eyes, it was not immediately possible to figure out that the war was On July 19, 1870, France declared Prussia! Moreover, our great writer Ivan Sergeevich Turgenev, who is closely connected with the French social environment, nevertheless assessed this announcement as "disenfranchised (*that is, unfounded*. - S. K.), impudently frivolous." And arrogantly aggressive, I will add already.

The French empire of Napoleon III set out to at least appropriate the Rhine province with historical cities

Cologne, Aachen, Trier (the birthplace of Karl Marx), that is, as the same Turgenev: "almost the most precious edge of the German land for the German heart."

The French were sure of victory in advance. Their shotgun Chaspo in range (up to 1800 m) and rate of fire (9 rounds per minute) was superior to the Prussian Dreyse needle gun. The decisive superiority of the Germans was in artillery: Krupp steel rifled guns they fired at 3.5 kilometers, and the French bronze ones - no further than 2.8 kilometers. Knowing this, we can say that the war turned out to be a kind of confrontation between the buffoonish "bronze feelings" and modern, newest "steel will and mind".

In his "Letters on the Franco-Prussian War", written in August 1870 in Baden-Baden, Turgenev noted: "The chances are on the side of the Germans. They showed such abundance heterogeneous talents, such strict correctness and clarity of intention, such strength and accuracy of execution, their numerical superiority is so great, the superiority of material means is so obvious"...

Turgenev also wrote about the opponents of the Germans: "I have noticed before that the French are less they are interested in the truth... They greatly appreciate wit, imagination, taste, ingenuity - especially wit. But is there any truth in all this? With this unwillingness to know the truth at home is combined with laziness to find out what is happening with others, with neighbors. And besides, who doesn't know that the French are "the most learned, most advanced a people in the world, a representative of civilization and fighting for ideas"... Under the current formidable circumstances, this conceit, this ignorance, this fear of the truth, this disgust for with terrible blows fell upon the French themselves.

Turgenev hoped that the defeats would bring France to reason, make her look at herself himself with a sober look, as was the case with Russia after the Crimean War. However, running forward, we can say that the French did not draw the right conclusions ... Instead of work hard, learn from the Germans daily building the country's economic power (and at the same time learn and respect your neighbor teachers, as our Peter did with respect to Swedes), the French put all the passions of the Gallic soul into the idea of "revenge on the bosses." AND This circumstance alone gave reason to expect a major military conflict on the same battlefields - in the area of Strasbourg, Metz, Chalons-sur-Marne ... And to expect, through the fault of not so much the Germans, as the narrow-minded, but vindictive French.

The meaning of the Franco-Prussian war is often seen in the "conquest plans" of the Prussian junkers. Well, that was one of the reasons. But this is how he, this meaning, imagined in real time, a truly Russian man, who lived for a long time in France, who died in Bougival, near Paris, but who also considered Germany to be his "second fatherland." I mean, again, Ivan Turgenev. His testimonies and assessments are valuable for several reasons at once, because he is a well-informed contemporary, and a subtle, attentive observer, and a great writer, and an objective analyst committed to not one someone's side, but only their own vision of events. See Franco-Prussian war through his eyes will be both useful and interesting for us.

Yes, and, perhaps, unexpectedly ...

So, on August 8, 1870, Turgenev wrote to P. V. Annenkov: "From the very beginning, you know, was for them (*the Germans*. - S.K.) with all my soul, for in one irrevocable fall Napoleonic system I see the salvation of civilization, the possibility of free development free institutions in Europe: it was unthinkable until this disgrace received worthy of punishment ... Speaking without jokes: I sincerely love and respect the French people, I recognize their great and glorious role in the past, I have no doubt in their future significance; many of my best friends, the people closest to me, are French; and therefore suspect me in deliberate and unjust hostility to their homeland, you certainly do not become."

And Turgenev did not just express a personal point of view, but wrote the pure truth, saying: "All this time I diligently read both French and German newspapers and, in all honesty, heart, I must say that there is no comparison between them. Such fanfare, such slander, such ignorance of the enemy, such ignorance, finally, as in French newspapers, I could not even imagine ... Even in such efficient newspapers as, for example, Temps, one comes across news like that Prussian non-commissioned officers are following the ranks of soldiers with iron rods in their hands to drive them into battle, etc. ... And this is said at a time when all of Germany rose from end to end against the primordial enemy "... And the enemy really

was an old one - from the time of the Thirty Years War and the peace of Westphalia that followed in 1648, according to which France torn away from Germany Alsace and achieved the legal consolidation of German fragmentation into a bunch of small "kingdoms" and "principalities".

The sovereign trash is the same everywhere - in Russia of the early Middle Ages, in absolutist Europe. Russian specific princes, tearing apart the united Kievan Rus into destinies, "provided" Russia with a three-hundred-year-old Tatar yoke ... French dukes and counts - the Hundred Years' War in France. And the German "great" princelings, wanting to be "sovereign", for more than two hundred years blocked the path of Germany to unification. But "Westphalian" principles and ideas helped them in this. Not

without reason, even decades after Sedan, Chancellor of the German Empire von Bülow, speaking on November 14, 1906 in the Reichstag, recalled: "The Peace of Westphalia created France and destroyed Germany."

Now, when Germany was reborn and responded to a raised sword with a raised sword, the French showed neither intelligence, nor a sense of proportion, nor nobility. The official "Jornal officiel" assured that the goal of the war on the part of France was

the return to the Germans of their freedom (!). Soir magazine exclaimed: "Our soldiers are so sure in victory, that they are seized, as it were, by some modest fear of their own inevitable triumph! It

was written a month before Sedan! What is it?

At the

same time, a Parisian newspaper with the name "Freedom" praised a certain Mark Fournier for his article in Paris-journal, where it was said verbatim: "At last we will know the voluptuousness of beating. Let the blood of the Prussians flow in streams, waterfalls, with the divine fury of the flood! Let the scoundrel who only dares to say the word "peace" be immediately shot like a dog and thrown into the gutter "... The matter was not limited to words ... The

Germans were beaten (not on the battlefield, but peaceful Germans living in France) and expelled by a special decree (clean up everyone) from French limits. Turgenev noted: "Ruin threatens thousands of honest and hardworking families who settled in France in the belief that they were accepted into their bowels by the state. civilized."

At that time, Prussia was firmly considered a friend of Russia. This friendship, which began with fields of the "Battle of the Nations" at Leipzig, where Russian and Prussian soldiers shoulder to shoulder stood against Napoleon, constantly strengthened and growing economic mutual turnovers. However, the St. Petersburg press in the strangest way with foam at the mouth protested "against the German conquests". And the correspondent of Birzhevy Vedomosti reported that, they say, in Baden they are shouting: "Death to the French!", And the Russians resting there as a result of this, the ladies switched, they say, to the Russian

language. Turgenev, who, as we know, was in Baden-Baden itself, remarked to this: "Mr. the correspondent is worthy of being a French chronicler: there is not a word in his statement truth." In

fact, our ladies still preferred French to Russian.

Nizhny Novgorod accent. And they plucked lint not only for German, but also for French wounded, with whom (as well as with prisoners in general) the Germans then behaved like knights in different from the French. "Noble" chevaliers were called to the European war, as he wrote Turgenev, "bestial Turks (*Algerian Arabs*. - S. K.)", and they treated German prisoners, wounded, doctors and nurses are far from noble.

However, the civilized natural Frenchman - politician Paul Granier de Cassignac - denied subsidies to the Genevan Red Cross on the grounds that it would take care not only of the French, but also of the German victims of the war. Involuntarily recalls the statement of General Comte Dumas during the Napoleonic occupation Dresden. When the city was besieged by the allied Russian-Prussian troops, Dumas announced: "Rather all the inhabitants of the city will turn into corpses, rather than a single French soldier will die with hunger."

True, it did not come to this - Dresden was quickly occupied by the unforgettable Denis Davydov.

I will cite again the testimony of Turgenev, who was well versed in both politics and verbal expression of human thoughts and aspirations: "It is impossible not to admit that the proclamation of King William upon entering France is sharply distinguished by the noble humanity, simplicity and dignity of tone from all documents that reach us from opposite camp; the same can be said about the Prussian bulletins, about the messages of the German correspondents: here is a sober and honest truth; there - some kind of furious, then whining false. This, in any case, history will not forget. Subsequently, alas,

everything turned out so that Ivan Sergeevich's last forecast did not justified. Just because Germany-Prussia, having won the Franco-Prussian war, did not refused to take advantage of the fruits of victory, the Soviet "History of Diplomacy", for example, assessed the line of Prussia as "aggressive" and "unfair."

But Lenin, by the way, was calm in his historical assessment: "In the Franco-Prussian war, Germany robbed France, but this does not change the main historical significance

this war, which liberated tens of millions of the German people from feudal fragmentation and oppression by two despots - the Russian Tsar and Napoleon III.

Lenin should not be suspected of Germanophilism. In August 1915, at the height of the First world war, he wrote: "It is not the business of the socialists to help the younger and stronger robber (Germany) to rob the older and gluttoned robbers (*England and France*. - S.K.)".

Lenin was right both in his second assessment and in his first. On the eve of the Franco-Prussian war, the question of the unification of Germany was particularly acute. Created in 1867 The North German Confederation, under the constitution of which the Prussian King Wilhelm I led the German states north of the Main river as "president" of the union, its supreme military head and head of diplomacy.

The southern German states - Bavaria, Hesse, Wurttemberg - concluded with North German Confederation Agreement. And for Wilhelm, and for Bismarck, and for the people German masses, the new state of affairs was only a prologue to a unified German empire.

Turgenev commented on what was happening like this: "Is it really possible for one second doubt that some people in the place of the Germans, in their current position, would have acted differently? Yes,

Germany included Alsace and Lorraine within its borders, but not only by right winner, but also because the French, for example, the city of Strasbourg was founded as German Strasbourg and annexed to France only in 1681, a thousand years after your foundation! The names of the creators of the famous Strasbourg Cathedral: Erwin from Steinbach, Ulrich from Ensingen, Johann Gultz from Cologne - they speak for themselves ... And so the so-called "Oath of Strasbourg", given on February 14, 842 near Strasbourg, turned out to be both a monument of both Old French and Old German. Then two younger grandsons of Charlemagne swore to work together against their eldest brother Lothair. Louis the German (the future King of Germany) swore in German, and Karl Bald (the future king of France) - in French. In other words, the rights to these the lands were, in general, both the Germans and the French disputed and

equal. The collapse of the Second French Empire gave primacy to the Germans. After the Sedan disaster, Versailles became the headquarters of the Prussian king Wilhelm. In the Hall of Mirrors of the Palace of Versailles on January 18, 1871, and was German Empire proclaimed. Wilhelm became the first German emperor - Kaiser. Almost half a century has

passed, and the position of the two countries has changed in the opposite direction: in Germany was defeated in World War I. Generosity does not apply to virtues of the rulers of the European peoples. From generation to generation they are greedy, cruel and petty vindictive. Once again, this was confirmed by the Prime Minister of the French Republic Georges Benjamin Clemenceau. It was the walls of the Hall of Mirrors that he chose in Witnesses to the humiliation of now Germany in retaliation for the Sedan. So at Versailles was signed the last important international act in its "diplomatic" history - Versailles peace treaty of 1919. This

happened after the conclusion of preliminary peace conditions in French staff car in the forest of Compiègne on November 11, 1918. Another twenty years will pass, and again France capitulates. Hitler will order to drag the Compiègne wagon to sign capitulation necessarily in it. It would be possible to do without cheap symbols, but not forget: Hitler was only following in the footsteps of Clemenceau.

STATES started, fought, won and lost wars, while peoples regularly paid tribute in gold and lives. This distribution of duties was not something new, but after the Franco-Prussian war the scope and nature of the policy of "iron and blood" became completely different. Since that time, a new history of the world began, because in

the world has come a new powerful and dynamic factor of its transformation - the united imperial Germany.

Approximately in the same years, another most serious factor finally took shape - world financial capital, that is, banking capital, actively merged with trade and industrial life of the capitalist world and the ruler of this world.

Academician E. V. Tarle at the end of the 20s - as they say, in the footsteps that have not yet cooled down - wrote the book "Europe in the era of imperialism. 1871-1919". A brilliant historian and encyclopedist, he could not write uninterestingly, but far from always he penetrated the essence of events deeply ... Perhaps, love for France and dislike for Germany affected, but the picture of the era is somehow turned sideways in Tarle's book... The light of analysis falls on it in such a way that many important things are not noticeable due to incorrect glare, but the unimportant catches the eye not in its true meaning.

About the era preceding the First World War, Tarle in his usual bright manner wrote: "A grandiose external struggle was planned, a clash of the most gigantic forces that mankind has ever seen. Powerfully organized financial capital in England, and in France, and in Germany, moving diplomacy like puppets, everywhere pursued a systematic provocative policy. Powerful economic forces of more backward countries, like Russia and Italy, acted in the same spirit ... ". All

this is good and true, but ... But

Evgeny Viktorovich never came to a general, fundamental idea about that the "clash of the most gigantic forces" was planned primarily by someone who was across the ocean, that the actual direction in the theater of political puppets Golden Capital more and more decisively passed into the hands of Uncle

Sam. Alas, not understanding this, Tarle was mistaken in many other ways, seeing a mortal enemy Russia in Germany, although Germany could be the most suitable for Russia partner in the outside world. The

unification of Germany was not due to "iron and blood" in the first place. The meaning of these words of Bismarck was distorted immediately after their utterance, and they are for what was happening were not key. Germany was united by the desire of dozens of millions of Germans who realized that their true homeland is not Baden, Württemberg, Hesse or Darmstadt, and Germany, disunited for centuries and therefore for weakened for centuries. Now it was uniting, and in the new Europe very much depended on how the fate of German-Russian relations will develop.

Exactly

them. New times were advancing, and the period from Wilhelm's triumph at Versailles to Versailles triumph of Clemenceau (but is it Clemenceau?) set the tone for events for the whole Twentieth Century. Therefore, it is simply necessary for us, reader, to at least gallop through "Europam" of those years, to understand their own time.

There is no better "novel" about young imperialism than Lenin's work Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism. It's full of facts and figures that can't be named.

dry - there are so many tears, sweat, blood, greedy saliva, oil and kerosene, financial storms, ocean waters, golden showers and waterfalls of political eloquence...

By the intensity of the passions depicted, the pages of this Leninist "novel" can compete immediately with Shakespeare and Molière at the same time. Perhaps readers will think that I am exaggerating? Far from it. Often quoted by Lenin, far from literary Berlin magazine "Bank" believed that "on the international capital market, a comedy worthy of the pen of Aristophanes.

And the same magazine did not hide what the fees of the "actors" were: "a concession in the trade contract, a coal station (*that is, an extra port in distant waters for refueling cargo ships, and, if necessary, dreadnoughts.* - S. K.), the construction of a harbor, a fat concession, an order for guns ... ".

The latter became more and more necessary. Almost simultaneously with the Versailles speeches of Wilhelm, in 1872, the English Jew Disraeli - the leader of the aristocratic Conservatives, former and future Prime Minister of Her Royal Majesty Victoria and the future Lord Beaconsfield - performed at the Crystal Palace in Sydenham near London. The former main exhibition building of the 1851 World's Fair in London was penetrated through and through by the sun, and this is not a metaphor. The iron frame of the palace was filled with glass slabs: Crystal Palace was conceived as a symbol of light, provided with new possibilities of society. However, *this* - London - sun was not enough for Britain. For Disraeli, there was only a luminary that should not go over the British empire, which he called for expansion. Disraeli, a

friend of the Rothschilds, knew what he was talking about. Knew what his successor lord was saying Salisbury, who explained the new colonial policy of Britain as follows: "We used to be in fact the masters of Africa, without having to establish protectorates there or something like that, simply by virtue of the fact that we dominated the sea. Now had to expand and *formally* consolidate its presence, for to dominate in The world wanted not only the British lion.

In addition, by the end of the 19th century, the position of the lords, although outwardly strong, was only outwardly. Cecil Rhodes (after whom a part of Africa was called for a long time "Rhodesia") said in 1895 to his friend, the journalist Stand: "Yesterday I visited one assembly of the unemployed. When I heard wild speeches there, which were a continuous cry: "bread, bread!" - I, going home and thinking about what I saw, became more convinced than before that the importance of imperialism. We must take possession of new lands to accommodate the surplus population, to acquire new areas for the sale of goods produced in factories and in mines. Empire is a matter of the stomach. If you don't want a civil war, you must become imperialists..."

Rhodes, of course, did not say that if you want to be imperialists, then you they must also want war - imperialist, *external*. First, she quickly and permanently places part of the excess population in the "new lands" and provides a rapid turnover of steel, copper, cotton and soldiers' rations ... Secondly, without such a war there would be no manage simply because it was not only the English lords who thought about what they saw in working quarters. The pressure of the masses began to feel the ruling elite of all developed countries. Accordingly, not only Britain needed the war. In France, the

collapse of the Second Empire did not initially lead to the establishment of a Third bourgeois republic, but the socialist Paris Commune. And after 1871 the concept of "Versailles" in France acquired a very definite meaning - these were those bourgeois troops who came from Versailles to Paris and shot down the hopes of the workers at walls of the Pere Lachaise cemetery. Graves remained, but hope and memory did not disappear. Therefore, the French brothers of Rhodes in the class also had a headache about new lands and markets. Moreover, they knew what it was - a civil war. America began to boil

gradually. On May 1st, 1886, workers in Chicago went on strike and demonstrated to demand an 8-hour day. Instead of this many of them received 9 grams of lead, but lead is not always an appropriate social food for the masses. So far, however, the first "May Day" has not done the weather, and the future U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt wrote to Sister Anna that May: "My workers here are on ranches - people engaged in exhausting work, their working hours are longer, and wages the pay is not higher than that of many strikers; but they are Americans to the core. I would like them to be by my side against the rebels; my men shoot well and don't know fear.

The approach, however, was not particularly new even for America. The president Pennsylvania Railroad Thomas Scott six years earlier said: way: "Feed the strikers with machine-gun bursts for a few days, and you will see how they will take this kind of food.

Bullets, however, were only a temporary solution to the problem. At the beginning of the 20th century, 1 (one) percent of the "American nation" owned 47 (forty-seven) percent of the national wealth. For the "freest country" the ratio is somewhat unexpected. And could come times when even "Americans to the core" would not want to engage in from dawn to dusk with exhausting labor so that Colonel Roosevelt and his ilk amused themselves by destroying the last American buffalo in grand hunts.

The gallant colonel himself understood this rather quickly. In 1894 the economic crisis in the United States, which made 3 million people out of work, gave rise to such a phenomenon as the "march unemployed" to Washington, led by Jacob Coxey from Ohio. May 11, 1894 A strike began at the factories of the Pullman Carriage Company. Peak her unrest began on July 5, when the station and 700 wagons were burned. By August 3 strike managed to suppress by force, but it was only a temporary victory. And in 1897 Roosevelt writes a number of "social" articles, one of which was directly titled: "How not to help our poor brother." No,

Roosevelt—now governor of New York—has not changed. Achieving concessions to the workers from the industrialists, he kept the national guard at the ready. After after he became president, federal troops became his reserve. Yet it was progress: bullets no longer came to his mind as the first and most reliable argument. In 1899 he wrote to his friend Lord Spring Rice: "We have to deal with the enormous problems arising from the relationship between labor and capital. In the next fifty years we will have to pay much more attention to this issue than to expansion ...".

Roosevelt even lied to an old friend: US Capital paid attention to the labor issue only after the United States in 1929 found itself on the brink of a social revolution. take away from her, Capital entrusted America to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Theodore's cousin Roosevelt. But he himself has already begun the expansion ...

It was the United States that waged the first imperialist war in 1898. It was a war with Spain for new colonies. However, even before that, in 1893, the Yankees occupied Hawaiian Islands. Roosevelt was not president in 1898, but his younger friend and like-minded writer and journalist William White wrote: "When the Spaniards surrendered to Cuba and allowed us to capture Puerto Rico and the Philippines, America at this crossroads turned onto the road leading to world domination. Was sown on the globe American imperialism. We were condemned to a new way of life."

How stupid the world turned out to be if it forgot these black words of White and more and more succumbs to US domination, mortifying the world.

Hypocrisy has always been as much a family trait of the American elite as forceful arrogance. White confirmed this once again: it appeared from him that if it were not for "weaklings" are Spaniards, then good Uncle Sam would sit quietly between two oceans and go nowhere there would not be a break from there. Here everything was put, of course, upside down. Not a weakness Spain "turned" America to expansion, and the Capital of America, having gained strength, moved along path to world domination, kicking decrepit Spain aside.

The Spanish-American War began, among other things, with the fact that on February 15, 1898 The American cruiser Maine was blown up in the port of Havana by a supposedly Spanish mine. 260 sailors were killed, a newspaper campaign began in support of the intervention in Cuba "for protecting U.S. civilian personnel and U.S. property"...

The war did not last long: having begun on April 24, 1898, from July 26 it turned into phase of "peace" negotiations, and on December 10, 1898 ended with a "peaceful" Paris treaty under which Spain renounced claims to Cuba, handed over to America in as war reparations to Puerto Rico and the island of Guam and for compensation of 20 million dollars ceded to the Philippines.

As for the Maine, when many years later the sunken ship was raised from the bottom of the sea, It turned out that there was an explosion, but *from the inside* !

The ELITE of America began to consider itself the elite of the world, but in the Old World there were people who thought differently than the same Roosevelt and White. Lord Curzon wrote in 1892: "Afghanistan, the Trans-Caspian region, Persia are for me the cells of a chessboard, on which the party is played; the stake in it is world domination. Curzon was

referring, of course, to British dominance. And then it was real. TO In 1900, Great Britain owned 33 million square kilometers (109 times larger than the British Isle itself!) on which 368 million people lived. Quarter the globe and a quarter of the world's population! India was here only the main pearl in the British crown, and the Suez Canal - an English noose on the throat of world trade.

It cannot be said that no one in the same Russia saw then an ominous character promising Anglo-Saxon policy on both sides of the Atlantic. Yes, it's not fair forgotten Russian geopolitician, General Staff Major General Alexei Efimovich Vandam (Edrikhin) wrote in his work "Our situation" in 1912:

"Simple justice requires the recognition of world conquerors and our life rivals of the Anglo-Saxons of one undeniable quality - never and in nothing our vaunted instinct does not play in them the role of the virtuous Antigone (*in Greek mythology, the daughter of Oedipus, king of Thebes, who accompanied her blind father on his wanderings.* - S.K.). Carefully observing the life of mankind as a whole and evaluating each event according to the degree of its influence on their own affairs, they, by the tireless work of the brain, develop in themselves the ability to see and almost feel at a great distance in time and space what seems to people with a lazy mind and weak imagination an empty fantasy. In art struggle for life, that is, politics, this ability gives them all the advantages of a brilliant chess player over a mediocre player. Dotted with oceans, continents and islands the earth's surface is for them a kind of chessboard..." That's how exactly it is

said - for growth, for a century ahead! Already at the beginning of the 20th century, Vandamme wrote about the "chessboard" of the Anglo-Saxons, and Zbigniew Brzezinski at the end of this century called his The Grand Chessboard book.

It is unlikely that separate comments are required here, but I will give one more assessment. Anglo-Saxon Vandam: "The earth's surface is for them a kind of chess board, but carefully studied in their basic properties and in their spiritual qualities rulers of the peoples - living pieces and pawns, which they move with such calculation that their opponent, who sees in every pawn in front of him an independent enemy, in the end is lost in bewilderment, in what way and when the fatal a move that led to the loss of the game ...".

The then rulers of Russia did not listen to Vandam, which led them to collapse. Today's rulers of Russia are no more far-sighted than the tsar and his advisers...

I wonder how it will end for Russia? Let us return, however, to the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries ... In 1901, the President of the United States became Theodore Roosevelt... the British controlled the Suez Canal and the United States Roosevelt were preparing to tighten - nowhere tighter - the freedom of Central and South America "noose" of the Panama Canal. However, the full masters of the Yankees, even in the Western Hemisphere have not been yet. Having piles of gold, they did not yet have a powerful fleet, and therefore Brazilian, for example, railways were built mainly on French, Belgian, British and German capitals. Due to the lack of battleships, the States then wielded more principles policies of "open doors" and "equal opportunities". Under "equal opportunities" was understood the possibility of any action USA in the outside world and the impossibility of any action of the outside world in the USA itself...

For all that, the United States was imbued with a consciousness of a future role ruler of the world of the 20th century. Moreover, a new, superpower mood was present not only in secret plans, but manifested itself even at the level of mass consciousness. Great American writer O'Henry wrote his "Kings and Cabbage" in 1904, ten years before the First world war. And even then his "star-striped" consul in banana Anchuria said

about the United States as "the greatest, hard-currency and gold-reserving power in the world ...". But back *then* it didn't even exist! The US was then the world's biggest *debtor*! France, although it suffered the Sedan fiasco (if necessary, pay solid reparations to the Prussians), managed to grab the second "colonial" prize after Britain - 11 million square kilometers of colonies with 50 million half-slaves. On French received orders from a third of Africa! But France remained in this race far behind England. But she recouped in Europe, which will be discussed later.

The word "race" here expressed the essence. In the second half of the nineteenth century the sails gave way to steam. The fleets of the powers rushed around the globe, as in a regatta. And the world was finally divided between the capital of different countries very soon. We are somehow inclined to believe that it was already divided among the European powers during the time of Sir Francis Drake, Queen Elizabeth and La Pérouse. However, what was needed Europe in the XVII-XVIII centuries from the vast outside world? Tobacco, tea, coffee, spices, exotic colors, precious woods, fruits and some other little things.

Therefore, until the 19th century, the planet was, in fact, "ownerless". Only advances in technology and knowledge quickly brought to life many new needs, including the need for the West's colonial conquests. The newly discovered periodic table from pure scientific achievement before our eyes turned into a trading price list. Waste lands, soiled with spots of oil seeps, began to be valued more expensive than gold-bearing veins ... In 1876 - five years after

Sedan - the colonies occupied only a tenth of "Black Continent", and by 1900 - already nine-tenths! At that time it was completely Polynesia was occupied, and in Asia they completed what had previously been left unclaimed. Formally only Turkey, Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan, China and Siam remained independent there. However, even there "white" capitals frolicked with might and main, with the exception of Afghanistan.

Russia did without colonies, she even refused to accept Russian citizenship lands discovered in the southern hemisphere by Miklouho-Maclay. But the Russian Empire of the Tsar Nicholas did not refuse to be a semi-colony itself. English explorers Tugenhat and Hamilton wrote that the oil fields of Baku already in 1888 gave two and a half million tons of oil on an area of just a few tens of square kilometers. Some wells spontaneously gushed to a height of more than 90 meters. family Nobel, just one of these wells produced more than a million gallons of oil per day. That is every day - *the state of* .

Tugenhat and Hamilton compared the extravagance and wealth of some oil industrialists with the atmosphere in the palaces of the Golden Horde Kubilai Khan. One "Oil King" had a palace made of gold plates, another kept oil in tanks made of platinum, all imported many beautiful women from Russia and had hired troops "kochi" from the ruined Georgian nobles for protection and protection from each other.

That's what kind of life the world's "golden" bastard led at the expense of Russian subsoil. What did she have Russia? Tugenhat and Hamilton did not hide this: the overcrowding of workers' barracks and hard labor - bread and water in half.

In addition, by 1913 Russia also received ... an acute fuel "hunger": production oil has decreased in comparison with 1901 by 2 million tons. Oilmen referred to "natural depletion of the bowels." In fact, for the sake of price gouging new oil-bearing fields were mothballed, drilling was reduced in the old ones. closed oil refineries. The world was

divided into territorial pieces, but capital penetrated through any borders unhindered and taken into debt bondage no less tightly than a white planter - black slaves in stocks. In

the same way, they took into bondage the richest, but hobbled by the idiocy of the authorities Russia. Compared to England, France did not have much luck with colonies outside of Europe, but it took its toll in Europe itself. England placed abroad twice in total more capital than France, but for every "European" English billion

accounted for almost six billion French! And almost a third of foreign French capital was invested in Russia. And this almost automatically provided millions of Russian peasants with French rentiers bayonets by their side in any major conflict.

The CONFLICT is mature. Moreover, there were not even applicants for one world domination three, but four. The Big Three (USA, England, France) was energetically breaking through Germany, turning it into the Big Four of Capital. At the same time, German Capital was more national than Anglo-French (and even more so - American), and was, so to speak, a little "on the outskirts" because of originality and novelty. After the complete defeat of the French army at Sedan, Kaiser Wilhelm I, raising glass for his companions, said: "You, General Roon, have sharpened our sword, you, General Moltke ruled it, and you, Count Bismarck, your policy for several years raised Prussia to its present height.

Despite the rather respectable age of both the author of the toast and its addressees, such a toast spoke of state youth: a sluggish monarch surrounded by relaxed courtiers will not be able to say anything like that. In the same imperial Britain of the late 19th century, such energetic toasts were impossible, despite all the imperialist the fervor of Rudyard Kipling. There everything rolled along a long-knurled rut. restless personalities like Cecil Rhodes could only work successfully on the periphery of the world, but not in Europe.

And the Germans managed to turn around - and how! - in Europe. Yes, even by force of arms! And toast Kaiser with colorful expressiveness uncharacteristic of Wilhelm reflected the obvious fact: the German Reich grew on cleverly built militarism, and this was a feature only German imperialism. The

capital of the United States developed, although even more vigorously, but richer capital The United States developed without the slightest external military threat, and therefore could allow for themselves right up to 1917 the luxury of ostentatious peacefulness and pacifism. Paris, of course, is more charming than Berlin. Yielding to the age-old charm of the "capital peace," some people tend to admire France and slander Germany. And, say, the novelist Valentin Pikul, in the manner of a frivolous Parisian, reports to the reader that poor de provincial German Werther has grown by leaps and bounds on an indemnity from France of five billion francs, "on robbery." And somehow

it remains outside *the romantic* lines that initially these indemnities were provided with the latest Krupp steel guns, and these guns themselves were created labor and talent of German scientists, engineers and workers. It was also forgotten that France, England, Holland, Belgium received much larger "contributions" also from robbery, and the brutal robbery of the colonial peoples. The Russian military attache in France,

Count Ignatiev, later rightly recognized that "the Franco-Prussian war was won not only by Moltke, but also by the German non-commissioned officer, rural teacher "...

However, Wilhelm I himself probably had a positive meaning here. Here it is quite reliable (from the "Great Soviet Encyclopedia" of 1928) characteristic: "In personal life was very modest, thrifty, untalkative, extremely punctual and conscientious at work." Qualities that color the common man, and even more so the monarch. Sometimes

German national consciousness and pride awakened in the Germans means, generally extraordinary for the XIX century ... In Paris - four years before the first Versailles triumph of the Germans - at the Second World Exhibition of 1867 was arranged as follows called the "European concert". For the championship in the European arena (so far only musical) military ... orchestras fought. And this is how

Vladimir Vasilyevich Stasov described the results of the "battle of bandmasters": "The Austrian and Prussian orchestras were recognized as the first - there was nothing to do with this, they

superiority was already too palpable for the French themselves ... Hearing the Austrians and the Prussians, the emperor himself (*Napoleon the Third*. - S.K.) exclaimed: "Here are the real examples of military music! That's what we need to achieve "...

The Prussians, however, did not give the French time either to hone musical skill, nor for sharpening swords.

And here is another symbolic detail: on the very first day of the Franco-Prussian war Prussian Andersen won the match against the strongest chess players in Baden-Baden Europe.

All this *together is* the persistent daily work of the "tops", the efforts of the people's German masses, a military victory over France and, yes, five billion reparations - ensured the rapid growth of the economy of the Second Reich. In 1873 a crisis came, consumption fell twice. However, German production, and hence German power, grew.

And from 1884 German colonial conquests began: Cameroon, Togo, the Marshall Islands. German Southwest and East Africa appear, in Oceania - Bismarck Archipelago, Emperor Wilhelm Land.

In the penultimate year of the 19th century, Germany, taking advantage of the Spanish-American war, included the Caroline, Mariana Islands and the western group of islands in the empire. Samoa.

In the midst of the colonial boom in 1891, an ultra-nationalist Pan-German Union, the goals of which were completely determined by the name itself. One of his ideologues, General Friedrich von Bernhardi, said: "We must ensure the German nation and the German spirit all over the globe, the high respect they deserve."

There is nothing wrong with wanting to be deservedly respected. It was bad that Bernhardi himself explained: "Our political tasks are impossible and unsolvable without sword strike..."

RECENTLY there was no German Reich on the world map at all, but by the beginning of the twentieth century, it became the third colonial power, although it was inferior here even to France four times the area of the colonies and their population. Germany moved to third position on the export of capital, almost equaling the overall result with France. And half Germany placed its capital in Europe, and here it was only slightly behind France. Was and feature: almost a third of foreign capital Reich sent *to America* - 10 billion marks. The planetary financial capital was

then distributed as follows ... In the world there were approximately 600 billion francs of securities. Of these, England accounted for 142 billion, the United States - 132, France - 110 and Germany - 95. If someone interested in Russia, I can report: 31 billion against 24 billion of Austria-Hungary and 12 billion Japan. Italy - 14 and Holland also crossed ten billion - 12.5 billion.

Formally, tsarist Russia was the fourth power in many gross indicators of the world, but not only in terms of per capita, but also in terms of defining economic indicators entered, perhaps, even in the world "top ten" ...

The owners of world capitals united in supranational cartels and divided the spheres influence. Without much fuss and founding congresses, the world Golden International". By its very nature, there could be no talk of *good* agreement. Consent was, but fragile, *evil* . All this was distributed very unevenly - colonies, capital, dividends and economic opportunities.

States, as an industrial and financial power, could quickly reach the first position, Germany - on the second. And the supranational rail cartel, two-thirds of the foreign gave markets to England. The kerosene market was divided between the American Rockefeller's Kerosene Trust and the masters of Russian oil, Rothschild and Nobel.

To squeeze between them for Germany meant to fall between two millstones. But the emerging electric market was divided by the American "General Electric" and the German AEG. The first received the States and Canada, the second - Germany, Austria, Russia, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, Turkey and the Balkans. Britannia is clearly the mistress of the seas remained "aground" here, but easily bypassed the two electric superpowers by colonial courses ... But

even on the seas, Germany in some places already bypassed England. The two largest German shipping companies "North German Lloyd" and "Hamburg-America Line", on the portal the Hamburg office which flaunted the inscription: "The field of my activity is the whole world", had together 148 ships with a total capacity of 770 thousand tons. Three English ships - British India Steam Navigation, White Star Line and Cunard - had 155 ships with a capacity of 700,000 tons. However, John Pierpont Morgan soon took over both German firms. Teutonic patriotism is patriotism, and dollars and dollars in Germany.

The overall picture was variegated, and the division of the world of the future *redistribution* did not take place. canceled. On the contrary, the development of world imperialism made the struggle for a new redistribution of the world. Interests were heterogeneous, and the only thing that was the same was the desire for maximum profit and providing conditions for it. However, at

the turn of the two centuries, all the main participants in the future world conflict once united in a perfectly close-knit, friendly coalition. And hardly ever before this and later, history knew an alliance more durable, more consistent and sincere, driven by more common ideas. This geopolitical miracle happened in China.

Since the second half of the nineteenth century, only lazy. The Yankees were especially distinguished, but the Germans, the British and others cleaned up coastal China with such greed that even the patient in their Confucianism Chinese. A secret society with the convincing name "Yihequan" ("Fist of in the name of justice and harmony") began to prepare an uprising. It started in 1899.

This is where the "great unity" of nations, or rather the world elite, happened within the framework of suppression of the uprising in China. In "civilized" countries, the Yihetuan uprising was called "boxing", but Chinese peasants, artisans, coolies and small traders fought mostly with bare fists. But the fist of interventionists in the name of *injustice* was securely protected. And protected not by the skin and wool of a boxing glove, but by steel and lead. Germany, Japan, Italy, England, USA, France, Russia and Austria-Hungary took part in the intervention. English Admiral Seymour commanded a joint Anglo-American squadron, German Field Marshal Waldersee - combined ground forces. The fight

against the Yihetuan became the first joint global action of the Golden International. She also showed for the first time that there is no limit to the unity of diverse tribes. priests of Capital in the matter of planetary opposition to peoples defending their rights to to their land.

The uprising in China dragged on for two years, and at the dawn of the 20th century it was brutally suppressed. Why, even the predatory beasts gathered in China then in order: heraldic aristocratic British lions, French and Italian fighting roosters, "normal" one-headed eagles and two-headed feathered freaks, as well as democratic republican elephants and donkeys ...

And, contrary to all the rules and norms of the scientific classification of the world fauna, all these predators belonged to the same family of jackals ...

Chapter 2. The policy of Prime Minister Witte against the policy of Chancellor Bismarck

HUMANITY was entering the twentieth century, on which many hopes were pinned, since the progress of science and technology really promised a lot. Already in the first third nineteenth century, in 1834, Nikolai Vasilyevich Gogol wrote: "On countless thousands of graves rises like a phoenix, the great 19th century. How much noise and swept up to him great, great happenings! How many great things happened, how many different images, phenomena, diverse political societies, forms overexisted. What the abyss of experience must acquire the 19th century! Rich and extensively developed our smart nineteenth century, which gave humanity such happiness as a reward for its difficult and miserable journeys.

The 19th century of Gogol did not justify the hopes of the great Russian writer and his certification completely, but this century really changed the world beyond recognition and for the first time made human heritage throughout the planet.

What would Gogol say, looking at the fruits of the nineteenth century on the eve of the century twentieth? Obviously, this would be an inspired hymn to the upcoming final liberation of people from ignorance and disasters ... After all, new scientific and technological achievements have opened unprecedented opportunities for humanity to improvement of society in the interests of all members of society!

However, crystal dreams of an abundant, new "golden age" were dispelled in the last century of the second thousand years from the birth of Christ, like smoke from a fire The Crystal Palace, which burned down in 1936, three years before the outbreak of World War II. Before the century had time to get stronger, the First World War began in it.

Why did it happen? Taking a mental look at those years today, we can say that there were four reasons: the British Empire wanted to have an unset

sun, they did not want to let Kaiser Wilhelm into Paris, Bismarck quarreled with Russia, and President Roosevelt gave newspapers reason to portray himself as a gardener on cartoon titled "Roosevelt Plants the Tree of Imperialism". And I, in general,

am not joking, reader. Of course, the main reason was that the world twentieth-century capitalism simply could not help but try to solve its problems with the sword. However, what I said was also of considerable importance: the greed of the English elite, the arrogance of the French, the mediocrity of the Russian and the special position of the American Capital.

Perhaps someone has already noticed that there is no German language in the list component. And this is no coincidence. The German Reich and German Capital were also involved in the "creation" of this monstrous war, but in their actions towards to the outside world were perhaps the most convincing. It turns out, and the least to blame.

In 1888, Kaiser Wilhelm I died at the age of 92, and 99 days later board died and his successor - the sick son Frederick III. new emperor Germany was the grandson of Wilhelm I - 29-year-old Wilhelm II (1859-1941).

Kaiser Wilhelm II twice informed the French of his desire to visit Paris with official visit. The French stupidly refused, and Wilhelm had pride with excess: from a young age he had to develop character, struggling with the consequences birth trauma.

Of course, Marx also said that since Germany conquered Alsace-Lorraine, France would go to war with Germany. Moreover, Marx noted, France will fight together with Russia. But, although in fact Marx hit what is called the point, the move his reasoning was not so true: the union of France and Russia was not programmed automatically, objectively, things were rather the other way around.

Nevertheless, Marx accurately noted that France without Russia to confront Germany not capable. No matter how the Gallic rooster swaggered, it was not with the German eagle compete. France had a good two centuries of development of only a fully centralized

states (not counting three more centuries of a single one), and Germany, having arisen as an integral part of the state almost at the end of the 19th century, bypassed France in economic development for two decades! Such people should not be treated arrogantly or lightly. As the French did just that.

So the Pan-Germanists, perhaps, had some right to declare in 1912: "We do not may believe that we alone must be content with the modest share which fate gave us forty years ago. Kaiser

Wilhelm II reasonably complained to the king of Italy: "For all the long years of my reigns, my colleagues, the monarchs of Europe, did not pay attention to what I said. But soon, when my fleet backs up my words, they will show us more respect. Wilhelm had in mind King

Edward VII of England and our Nicholas II. And grounds for German grievances were: neither English nor Russian European policy did not correspond to the national interests of Germany. Edward at the beginning of the 20th century traveled along Europe, preparing that policy which would isolate Germany and which he called "environment policy".

One hundred years later, in 2005, an economics professor of Italian origin from University of Washington at Tacoma Guido Giacomo Preparata in an extremely curious monograph "Hitler, Inc. How Britain and the United States Created the Third Reich

study of the world political process in relation to the Anglo-Saxon roots

World War I and wrote: "The main goal of this large-scale encirclement is to prevent strategic alliance between Germany and Russia: if these two powers merge into "brotherly embrace", then, as the British ruling circles believed, not without reason, they provide themselves with such inexhaustible sources of resources, people, knowledge and military power that could threaten the very existence of the British Empire in the coming century."

So, England, with far-reaching and by no means peaceful intentions, "surrounded" Germany - so far politically. Russia, on the other hand, began to "weave" into this unnecessary politics, to the delight of the French and Anglo-

Saxons ... At the same time, England was increasingly becoming a victim of its vast colonies and wealth associated with it. She seemed like an eternal colossus, capable of pointing even United States. Securities invested in the colonies, by 1913, brought them owners of £200 million in annual income. And for only a hundred pounds a year could already exist.

The dreams of Cecil Rhodes acquired a solid material foundation: the empire, at the very least, provided not only the aristocratic and bourgeois, but also the common people. stomachs on the English Isle.

However, wealth simultaneously corroded the foundations of power. English gold spread over the globe, and the result was a lack of it to build up inner strength. In 1913, the United States smelted 31.3 million tons of steel, Germany 17.3, and England only 7.7 million. Not having such colonies as the British, the Germans worked over the creation of a powerful country within its own borders. And the British "carried the burden white man" around the world. The occupation is profitable, but England itself was stunted, new branches of industry developed weakly and slowly in it.

France, the world usurer, found itself in approximately the same position. In France grew a layer of rentiers. Yes, they cut coupons from Russian loans, but this stimulated Parisian restaurateurs, not industry and military power. Gogol in beauty passage "Rome" prophetically caught and vividly, accurately described the expanding emptiness of the French society: "For all its brilliant features, with noble impulses, with knightly flashes, the whole nation was something pale, imperfect, light vaudeville, by her own generated. The whole nation is a brilliant vignette, not a painting by a great master."

As a result, the first *European* (and almost the second *world*) power gradually became Germany. Is it right? Perhaps yes. And the capital of the rest of Europe had two

way out: either cooperate with the mighty Reich, or fight with it. For France, cooperation with Germany meant submission. France could not lay claim to anything else, *also by right*. But since the 1980s France, as Germany strengthened, increasingly relied on the cover of "Russian shield."

Was it beneficial for Russia? Alexander II, Alexander III, the parasitic nobility and the absurd, provincially educated Russian bourgeoisie thought so. It was believed that an excessive weakening of the Gauls will strengthen the "Teutons" too much. Russian liberal professors have already seen Russian battleships in the "open spaces" of the Baltic, banners "Christ-loving army" - over the Black Sea straits and, accordingly, the Russian Tsar - the monarch of all Slavs.

IT WAS ALL nonsense. Russia has rot inside it or lay untouched such riches, the Russian land spread out so wide, and the peoples inhabiting it were so obscure that all Russia needed was to ensure reliable defense of the borders and take care of internal affairs.

Foreign participation in these grandiose affairs was inevitable, but nationally one principle could be consistent here: "The lion's share is for Russia, and you will *snatch* a lot."

Pyotr Arkadyevich Stolypin did worse than he said, but he said wisely: "You need great upheavals, but we need a great Russia." Great shocks to great Russia excluded. But even peaceful Russia could be great only by developing its richest outskirts. Central Asia, the European North, Siberia, the Far East were completely undeveloped ... Kaiser Wilhelm II was right three times when, saying goodbye after next rendezvous with the Russian Tsar, raised the signal "Admiral of the Atlantic Ocean welcomes the Admiral of the Pacific, hinting to cousin Nikolai that Russia should not meddle in Europe. Another thing is its eastern, Pacific

outskirts. Of course, the hint here was not without cunning:

Wilhelm had in mind, of course, the war

Russia with Japan and the strengthening of the confrontation in the Pacific Ocean with the Anglo-Saxons. However, advice Kaiser also contained a healthy grain: let him not fight, but work, but Russia needed in the Far East - within their own borders. Was it worth it for

a power with the richest internal resources intact to get into Korea, meddle in China, conflict with Japan? Nicholas II contemptuously called Japanese "makakas", and in Japan by the beginning of the 19th century there were practically no the illiterate.

Detail?

Yes! However, one such detail could keep the smart Russian leadership from reckless actions. But what kind of mind and leadership could there be if, during Russo-Japanese War, commander of the Pacific Fleet, Admiral Birilev the demands of the commander of the Vladivostok detachment of submarines for the allocation of 24 French spark plugs to the engine with an unwavering hand wrote: "Two pounds are enough state-owned stearic"? This,

alas, is not an anecdote, but the latest history of tsarist Russia, reader! England,

France, Germany were bright patches on the large-scale map of the world, and Russia stretched for half the world and was itself a world - original and self-sufficient. The European powers had already exhausted their internal possibilities and rushed to the colonies. But

Russia has not revealed, has not developed even a hundredth of the national wealth that were at our fingertips ... Having a mind and a heart, Lomonosov already understood this, but Russian the autocrats of the late 19th - early 20th centuries had neither a Russian heart nor a mind of any kind ... That's why they pursued such a stupid Far Eastern policy that Russian

paved the way to the Far East with blood, not so much for Russian as French and English capital.

So, in the Far East, criminal stupidities were committed on behalf of Russia. But as How were Russian affairs in Europe?

Clever Russian European policy fit into three words: "Peace with Germany." Such a peace made it possible to solve the Caucasian problems along the way, to develop Central Asia. Carry out a worthy, *self*-respecting "German" policy on the part of Germany. It would not be easy for Russia, but it is possible! No wonder Bismarck saw the future of Russian-German relations only as peaceful.

Yes, the contradictions between the two countries were considerable, although most of them had not objective, but bourgeois-capitalist character. In the most embarrassing way this manifested itself in the competition of Russian and Prussian landlord breads on German and European markets. There were other sharp moments, but they arose because of the breadth of relationships. One thing would be reasonable here: to smooth the corners and establish friendship, and the "mayors" of the all-Russian Glupov acted in the exact opposite way.

After Sedan, Alexander II demanded that Prussia limit itself to smaller reparations than she expected to receive from France. And so it went...

In 1875, Bismarck starts a preventive war against France. Russia Alexander II frustrates these plans. As a result, Russia after the Russian-Turkish war on The Balkans faced at the Berlin Congress with the opposition of Austria-Hungary and England, and Germany does not support it. By the way, in Berlin the fate of the southern Slavs Lord Salisbury and our acquaintance Disraeli, who had already become Lord Beaconsfield. The same duo subtly quarreled with the Russians and the Germans.

The desire for a permanent weakening of Russia in general was an invariable line Disraeli year after year. The calculation here was distant, for decades. And it did come out! In 1879, Wilhelm I and Alexander II quarreled completely. Close-minded, but proud the Russian "tsar-liberator" was offended by Germany for her behavior on the Berlin congress, as if Germany did not have serious counter claims against Russia.

The Congress of Berlin, summing up the results of the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878, is described differently in different countries, and in Russia Germany has long been blamed for it. Thus, the well-known Soviet historian Academician V. M. Khvostov believed that "Bismarck behaved duplicitously, playing an "honest broker". Even more sharply expressed 2nd edition Great Soviet Encyclopedia: "Chairman of the Berlin Congress Bismarck took a position that is clearly hostile to Russia and the Slavic peoples of the Balkan Peninsula.

In fact, Bismarck, both before the Congress and after it, was loyal to to the only state - Germany and to the only people - the German. Can we we be behind it on him in the claim?

Actually, the course and outcome of the Berlin Congress was influenced not by Bismarck, but by a secret Reichstadt Agreement signed by Alexander II and the Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph in the Bohemian castle Reichstad a year before the Russian-Turkish war - July 8 1876. Then the fact of his imprisonment was concealed from the Russian Slavophiles, which not surprising. After all, according to this agreement, the parties (and in fact, only Russia, of course) pledged not to assist in the formation of a "big Slavic society" in the Balkans. states". Thus, Russia ensured the neutrality of Austria in the war with Turks.

The results of this war and the Treaty of San Stefano, which ended it, stimulated a different turn of events, which was due to the two emperors before the start of the war: the masses the southern Slavs began to liven up more and more. The discontent of Austria and brought to life Congress of Berlin followed by revision of the Treaty of San Stefano. essence political conflict was the stupidity of high-ranking St. Petersburg and the tsar personally, which poorly understood by both then and present Slavophiles.

Four months before the Berlin Congress, Turgenev wrote in a letter from Paris:

"Our country dance with England has just begun; the most intricate figures are ahead. Bismarck, apparently, wants to confine himself to the role of "tapper": dance, they say, darlings, and we We'll see".

Turgenev has no condemnation of Bismarck. Our great writer thought soberly: his own the shirt is closer to the body. Especially when it's not a "shirt", but a MOTHERLAND! FATHERLAND! which must be loved not only with the heart, but also intelligently loved, which Alexander II did not even close was ...

By the way, here is the final (after the congress) opinion of General Dmitry Alekseevich Milyutin, one of the authors of the San Stefano Russo-Turkish Treaty, significantly truncated by the Berlin Treaty: "If we achieve at least that has now been decided by the Congress, then even in this case a huge step will be taken in historical course of the Eastern Question. The result will be enormous, and in Russia it will be possible take pride in your accomplishments."

Milyutin was a practical politician, in contrast to professors and literary babblers-Slavophiles. Therefore, both he and Chancellor Gorchakov understood that Russia had won such a victory in the East, which far exceeded ours. opportunity to use it. We already got a lot: Kars, Batum, consolidation their positions in the

Caucasus. The congress was held from June 13 to July 13 (a rare case of openly provocative symbols) of 1878 at the request of England and Austria-Hungary. Just ended Russian-Turkish war (the same one when "everything was calm on Shipka"). Russia almost took Constantinople-Istanbul, that is, almost gained control over the Black Sea straits. If

such a situation were fixed (which, in general, was absolutely "not for us") teeth"), then the British lion would only have to drown himself with grief in the Sea of Marmara, as times between the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. To prevent this from happening, Britain is still in February 1878 (by the way, also on the 13th) sent a squadron of 6 ships to the Dardanelles and sharply pressed Russia. The strong positions of

Russia in the Slavic world were of no use to the Austrians either. Provide such positions seriously, that is, economically, we were not able, but even growth our moral authority among the "Slav brothers" caused a panic in Vienna. One week before Berlin Congress, the British and the Austrians concluded an agreement on a joint (and here certainly anti-Russian) line of conduct in Berlin. The agreement was kept sacred, but Bismarck did not help the Austrian Foreign Minister Count Andrassy and the eternal Lord Beaconsfield, that is, Disraeli. Last crossed the English Channel 20 years ago, and upon arrival in Berlin, I immediately ordered a return special train to Calais, hinting that he recognizes only one direction of the work of the delegations of the great powers - according to the London scenario ... The

formal head of our delegation - the Chancellor and Prince Gorchakov - shone with manners. But the "first violin" was played by the "second delegate" - Count Shuvalov, with whom Bismarck established respectful and trusting relationships. After the congress about Shuvalov it was said that he allegedly betrayed the interests of Russia. Stupid certification ... Yes, and incorrect.

As for the political position of the German chancellor, it was perhaps most correctly assessed by an outside observer in this case ... Professor Antonin Debidur in his "Diplomatic History of Europe" wrote: "Bismarck wished that Russia remained strong enough, at least enough to serve counterweight to Austria-Hungary, since he did not want to allow Germany to fall into dependence on the Habsburg Monarchy.

Of course, Bismarck also feared a serious strengthening of Russia, and it is understandable. WITH on the one hand, Bismarck was not Russian, but German, on the other hand, the relationship "Christian" states were built by no means on evangelical principles.

I repeat: we have nothing to be offended by such an approach of Bismarck to the matter. On the contrary, here there was much to learn, if we mean the protection of national interests. Didn't interfere then draw the following conclusion: on sentimental dynastic and historical Russian-Prussian sympathies are no longer worth relying on, just as it is not worth counting on "eternal gratitude" to Germany for the past support of her by Russia in conflicts with France and Austria.

States are not people. And behind the competent actions of the heads of state are not personal predilections, but the logic of peoples' lives. Alas, in Russia they did not want to understand this. Even such a subtle diplomat (and not just a poet) as Fyodor Tyutchev was offended by the Germans. And by this day in our historical literature, especially in the works of neo-Slavophiles and neo-Pan-Slavists, it is argued that in the era of the first Balkan crises, Bismarck wanted to de pit Russia and Austria-Hungary. In fact,

Bismarck could not aspire to anything like this, just because such the turn of European political life would lead Russia to an alliance with France. After all, in those times, the conflict between Vienna and Paris was not just traditional, but ongoing - it then constantly fueled the "Italian" question. And with what and with whom would you stay then Germany? Good relations with Austria-Hungary for its confident future were desirable, and with Russia - vital. No, Prince Otto von Bismarck-

Schönhausen was not so stupid as to play with fire. Another thing is that, striving for strong ties with Russia, Bismarck thought about the Germans, and not about Russians and a petty demon before us did not crumble. His scale was not the same - and bodily, and historical ... Bismarck

did not provoke any conflicts at all insofar as they could lead to this or that coalition, which haunted him like a "nightmare". But in Russia did not see anything wrong with coalitions, although they were harmful to us no less than for Germany.

The already mentioned Minister of War of Alexander II, D. A. Milyutin, is certainly an outstanding figure. The reformer of the Russian army after the Crimean War - this alone everything is said. However, in foreign policy, Milyutin of outstanding abilities, alas, is not showed. Perhaps the lack of proper temperament had an effect here: the general was balanced man and lived for almost a hundred years (born in 1816, died in 1912!). And he could, for example, at first fearlessly prepare the San Stefano Treaty, according to to which Russia received more than it could keep, and then, after the Berlin Congress, it is melancholy to admit the excess of the ideas of one's own offspring.

Being an honest but inflexible man, Milyutin saw in Bismarck's behavior not a natural line for a German, but "the intrigues that entangled the aged emperor (*Wilhelm I.* - S.K.)".

Approximately the same "thought" and Alexander II himself. In 1879 the Russian Emperor writes to his uncle - the German emperor - a letter that Bismarck appreciated nothing more than provocation, and the letter smacked of it. The position of Germany was regarded there as hostile to Russia on the grounds that Bismarck did not lay down his bones for Russian interests. But not everyone can be simpletons, like Russians, who willingly turn their heads how much in vain for other people's and even alien ideas to us! Bismarck once said: "The policy of England has always been to find such a fool in Europe who, with his sides would defend British interests "... That's it ... Say,

academician Tarle in 1951, even after the anti-Soviet and anti-Russian Churchill's Fulton speech, without a shadow of irony, stated in the Izvestia newspaper: "One of great British political leaders, William Pitt the Elder (Lord Chatham), made friendship with Russia one of the foundations of his policy. "I am a Russian" ("I am Russian"), he said half-jokingly, half-seriously about himself" ...

Tarle obviously forgot about Krylov's Raven and Fox, friendly attesting that English prime minister of the late 18th century, who before, during and after the Seven Years' War of 1756–1763 actively intrigued against Russia! Even after that war, the Russians the sides had to take on a lot of kicks for British interests in the Napoleonic wars and Russian-Turkish wars, in the Russian-Japanese and in the First World War ...

Alas, MILYUTIN turned out to have no more political intuition than Tarle. "Offended" by Germany and "fearing" her, he undertook the redeployment (!!) of a number of military formations from the south and from the central regions of Russia to the border with Germany western provinces ...

There is no doubt that William Pitt the Elder applauded him from the grave for a couple with William Pitt the Younger (who also spoiled Russia where possible and where not).

It is not surprising, therefore, that Bismarck and Wilhelm I considered Milyutin a "German-phobe." In fact, the general was not. He was just full of suspicion the growing German Empire, although, like his colleague, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Girs, considered it necessary to maintain peace with her in every possible way.

The plans of the Russian General Staff under Milyutin were designed for defense. However defense was supposed to be from Germany, during the Russian-German war! And such "Extra-caution" Dmitry Alekseevich rendered a service to the Fatherland, alas, a bearish one.

The concentration of Russian troops on the German border worried Berlin very much. IN August 1879, Wilhelm I initiates his meeting with Alexander II in Alexandrov, where Milyutin was also. Wilhelm gave the Russian minister the highest German Order of the Black Orla and talked with him face to face for almost an hour ... Subsequently, the interlocutor of the German The emperor himself reported its content and reported it clearly without distortion.

"Why are you, General, so suspicious of the German Reich?" asked William.

"Allow me, Your Imperial Majesty, to answer a direct question directly. German policy is hostile to Russia. She supports the enemies of Russia in everything - England and Austria. And they are inciting Turkey against us. Wilhelm

was not particularly emotional, but then in his tone suddenly apologetic notes slipped in half with annoyance: - But, General, you are well aware that we are constantly under threat from sides of France. Paris cannot help but think about revenge...

Milyutin barely perceptibly shrugged his shoulders, and Wilhelm patiently explained:

- France is a traditional rival for England. Just like for Austria ... And so we have to be extremely careful to maintain this situation. We are not we can clearly break off either with Austria or with England and are forced to occupy a neutral position.

Milyutin again shrugged his shoulders in bewilderment and said:

"Let me object, Your Majesty, that such a passive policy unworthy of Germany, which is now quite powerful and quite high in the opinion of the whole of Europe. With your single voice, without drawing your sword, you can prevent a pan-European coalition against Russia, its age-old friend and ally.

Let's think, reader, what, in fact, did Milyutin offer the Germans? And here's what ... Just ten years before this conversation, Germany did not exist as a single state, and those but France, England and Austria were united in their desire to preserve forever European alignment of the times of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. In other words, have Germany and henceforth dismembered.

Through intense internal German work and a successful foreign war, the Germans provided themselves with a powerful historical perspective of rebirth, which automatically irritated both London and Vienna, not to mention Paris. After the Crimean disaster 1855, Russia was not considered capable of waging a successful *offensive* war against

European powers. Even in the Russian-Turkish war for Bulgarian freedom, victory was given us with a creak. Therefore, Europe was confident only in *the defensive* strength of the Russians.

And in this state of affairs, Milyutin, at the same time pushing troops to the border with Germany, was inclined to expect such behavior from Germany, when she headlong, "without drawing her sword", but threatening them, would eliminate the possibility of a pan-European coalition against Russia?

Didn't Milyutin and the tsar demand too much from "his age-old friend and ally"? In addition, the coalition was formed against Russia not military, but political. And not with the aim of invading Russia, but with the aim of stopping the advance Russia to the Slavic Balkans, that is, to where we, frankly, had nothing meddle.

It was this last moment that Milyutin understood, because he sighed - God forbid, they say, to master what the Berlin Treaty allows. However, for some reason, he also wanted the Germans pulled back the British, dirtying us in Turkey. And why

did Berlin have to do this? Yes, even when cool in relation to the Germans were not only in the mood of Minister of War Milyutin, but also of his royal boss ... Moreover, in a situation where good relations with Germany had to be maintained by any price. After all, in 1879 in London, for example, our Fatherland evoked a feeling about which V. V. Stasov wrote as follows: "This is an extraordinary hatred for Russia and for everything Russian, reigning in entire strata of English society and in their expressive language - English print."

To assume in the late 70s - early 80s (and later) that Germany, for good will start *the first* war with Russia of his own free will, only a worthless Russian politician could. Alas, it was they who prevailed in Russia, starting with the main one "by rank" - the autocrat. A here they also played a joke with us, just the same malicious, violently erupted in Russian capitals, intellectual "love of Slavs" and pan-Slavist ambitions. Mikhailo Vasilyevich

Lomonosov already understood that Russian power should grow with Siberia, the Far East, the Russian North, including here the Northern sea route, as well as Russian America ... Lomonosov saw our abundant future as a result of Russian activity within Russian borders. And the unlucky the Slavophiles dragged us somewhere to "Saint Sophia", to the "gates of Constantinople" ... And if Germany did not assent to this whim, then for many, for some reason, this turned into enemy.

No, there were, were Bismarck's foundations exactly one month after the meeting of the two monarchs in Aleksandrov, to reproach our ambassador in Berlin, Saburov, with the fact that "the very Russian the government has given a pretext for cooling between Germany and Russia"...

And the fires of the Cossack patrols in the mind of East Prussia of Russian-German relations didn't warm up.

IN 1887, Bismarck again tries to achieve European hegemony, plotting destroy France. Now this was prevented by the slow-witted Russia of Alexander III.

Already at the beginning of his reign, the administration of Alexander (for although he fancied himself *autocrat*, but ruled far from single-handedly) intensified construction strategic railways in Poland. Objectively, it was, of course, anti-German act, especially when you remember that Russia desperately needed the development of railways inside the country, in the center, not on the periphery of the

state. About some "railroad" piquancy of the era at the turn of the reign Alexander III and Nicholas II, we will still have a reason to say a few words. But in the early 80s years in Russia, certain forces begin to inflate anti-Germanism. And a very bright figure here was the famous "white general", the hero of the Russian-Turkish war, the thirty-nine-year-old infantry general Skobelev Jr.

Mikhail Dmitrievich Skobelev was, of course, an outstanding commander and outstanding Russian man. But his political role did not embellish the fleeting biography of the general and the good service of Russia did not co-serve. Here is a typical example of it way of thinking: "We need a slogan that is understandable not only in the army, but also to the broad masses. So the slogan can only be a declaration of war against the Germans and the unification of the Slavs. This the slogan will make war popular in society."

About whether such a war would strengthen Russia economically, whether it would contribute to lasting strengthening of Russia, and not its fruitless exhaustion, Skobelev did not think. But in his fatal so-called "Paris speech" on February 17, 1882, in front of Serb students (4 months before his death), the general attacked Germany as an enemy of Russia. But he saw a friend in France, although the good old Gauls did not have to be fed with bread if it was possible to pour coals into the fire, on which Russian-German relations could be burned. The history of the "Parisian speech" is

obscure. To his friend, Vasily Ivanovich Nemirovich Danchenko, Skobelev said: "I know you were against my Parisian speech. But I told her according to my conviction and I do not repent. And in a letter to Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov, the general wrote something else: "What can I tell you about the speech *attributed* to me to Serbian students. I didn't actually pronounce it. Serbian youth came to my apartment, they spoke on to the soul, not for the press "...

It turned out, however, that it was for the press: the conversation "to the liking" was suddenly published by the newspaper France. That is, there was and was not a speech, although the general did not refuse the "France" option and to the same Aksakov he reported: "In the end, everything said there is the absolute truth." In short, the hot Skobelev was skillfully provoked, and he bit the bit. And soon he died a strange

death ... Apologetic authors writing about

Skobelev never give his assessments

Turgenev. And they are interesting ... On July 9, 1882, Turgenev wrote from Bougival in a letter actress Maria Gavrilovna Savina: "My soul is especially saddened today: yesterday it arrived news of Skobelev's death. For a long time I did not want to believe that our Achilles died so early and that those who predicted a great future for him were deceived ... Russia is unhappy in their great people. Our people, in whose eyes he was the most popular modern face, hardly believe in the naturalness of his death ... I would not be surprised if b knew that the Germans, his fiercest enemies, were subjected to a beating worse than a Jewish one.

Savina treated Skobelev enthusiastically, and this affected Turgenev's tone. IN In a letter to Annenkov, he was already much more restrained, and even more frank: "And then there's death Skobelev. Of course, I did not sympathize with him, but I felt bitter and sad, as, probably, all Russian people. Yes, Turgenev did not

sympathize with the living Skobelev, that's for sure! February 25 - immediately after Skobelev's speech, he wrote from Paris to his constant addressee Annenkov: "Skobelev turned out to be as brainless as Charles XII, whom he physically very much similar. Meanwhile, it seems to be supported in our higher spheres, and moreover aggravate the confusion reigning there. Amen, amen, I tell you...

We often imagine Turgenev as a kind of admirer of France. How about: in friends Flaubert, Maupassant, Hugo, in girlfriends - Pauline Viardot ... And Ivan Sergeevich had one passion, which, however, he did not really advertise - Russia. And his harsh assessment Parisian behavior Skobeleva once again confirmed this.

Skobelev provoked a war antagonistic to the interests of Russia, and for Turgenev in this was the main thing, devaluing all the previous merits of Mikhail Dmitrievich.

Skobelev died under really mysterious circumstances: in the room at luxurious Moscow cocotte Wanda, after a revelry, during which an unknown offered him a glass of champagne. Although the autopsy stated paralysis, they immediately crawled rumors about "German intrigues". However, this was hardly the case. extremist anti-Russian circles in Berlin (and they, of course, existed there and were quite strong) noise

around Skobelev's antics was only beneficial.

Rather, here you can see the hand of the secret organization of the court aristocracy "Sacred Squad", created after the execution of Alexander II in 1881 by the Narodnaya Volya. He led the "team" called to protect the emperor and fight the revolutionaries, the guards hussar, colonel and count Pavel Shuvalov - the son and nephew of the famous brother diplomats Shuvalov, with whom Bismarck was so close. Skobelev was

least of all a fighter for the freedom of the people, but interfered with the aristocrats by the fact that could become a pillar and support of any anti-palace opposition. Academician Tarle wrote about him: "An ambitious man of the highest order, dreaming not so much of Suvorov as of Napoleon." His anti-German speeches were also, of course, the "bast" that they put in the line.

One way or another, Skobelev died. But he left German circles hostile to Russia an ever-convenient excuse to make loyalty to Russia unpopular in Germany.

Bismarck (whom Skobelev could not stand after the Berlin Congress) the general was very alarmed. And he, along with the Shuvalovs, had to work hard to somehow improve the situation for the better. However, in Russia, more and more active pro-French (actually anti-Russian) political, economic and financial sharpeners. And so Russian-German relations were constantly in a fever, and the tone was set by often Alexander III himself. After Skobelev's February "speech", he recalled the latter to Petersburg, but the general left the royal office after a two-hour (!) Audience cheerful and satisfied, although two hours ago he approached the "royal gates" extremely embarrassed. For Berlin, all this, of course, did not remain a secret. After

the death of Skobelev, the Russian emperor sent his sister a very sympathetic and heartfelt telegram, in which there was not even a shadow "Officials", but there were words: "It's sad, very sad to lose such useful and dedicated workers."

Even Academician Tarle, who was always cold towards Germany, later admitted: "In Germany has never forgotten either the general's speech or the emperor's telegram.

AT ONE TIME, however, the gap seems to have been outlined ... June 18, 1887, with the efforts Shuvalov brothers and Bismarck signed the so-called "reinsurance agreement". Russia and Germany pledged not to attack each other and to remain neutral, except the case of Russia attacking Austria-Hungary, and Germany attacking France.

Damn we were in that France!

What did we have to do with

her? Alas, Alexander III did not go for more with Germany, and it was a narrow-minded, bastard policy. Russia's initiative attack on the Austrian Empire could not have been stupid and pointless move. And therefore it was almost unbelievable even for tsarism, in anyway then. But the military actions of Germany against France were real. Therefore, with its treaty, Russia insured France rather than Germany. Bismarck is understood, pressed on us. And Russian-German customs friction began. Dumb royal politics harmed both the economy and the future of Russia.

The French historian Antonin Debidour fought the Prussians in his youth and could not be objective in relation to Germany. But he portrayed no more correctly and Franco-Russian relations. According to Debidur - and he was a contemporary of all the described events - the initiative for rapprochement with France belonged to Russia, although in reality this was interested just dear to the heart of Debidura Gallia. France ensured itself, firstly, security. Secondly, it ousted Germany from the East. And Russia's alliance with France gave nothing but loans, which were cheese in a mousetrap, and not even free. In addition, we received an absolutely unprofitable enmity with the Germans.

Our ties with the Germans were not established yesterday. You can remember a lot of German by birth, but Russian by fate and merit to the homeland of German surnames, at least the same physicist Emil Khristianovich Lenz or Academician Karl Maksimovich von Baer, who wrote his works in German, but with one introduction to popular consumption

Caspian herring (instead of the "Dutch"), which increased the national wealth of Russia by millions of then very significant and very necessary rubles for us. Perhaps

the reader will be surprised, what does the "herring" have to do with it? And despite the fact that for those at times, in the devastation of the Crimean War, we still did not know how to cook herring in industrial scale alone. And for the first time it was Baer who succeeded - not only great Russian biologist, but also, as we see, a practical organizer of specific economic affairs, which strengthened our economic independence. Baer was

the initiator of the famous (alas, famous then, but now half-forgotten!) Trans-Siberian expedition of Alexander Fedorovich Middendorf in 1842-1845. One from the results of this expedition, another Russian German was joining Russia Amur region. However, this was the nineteenth century. However,

already in the time of Peter the Great, he walked across the expanses of Siberia for eight years - from blessings of the great Peter and by his order - Daniel Gottlieb Messerschmidt. Was born in Danzig, died in 1735 in St. Petersburg, in need ... Having quickly mastered Russian, he wrote about himself: "Understanding great labors and trips, he lost his health from intolerant multiple swamp and flowing waters, collected ancient mammoth bones, all kinds of stones and the like in Siberia. A native of

Leipzig, Gottlieb Schober, also at the behest of Peter, explored the Volga region, the Terek, the Caspian. Died in Moscow.

Here is how academician Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadsky assessed their services to Russia: "The natural science study of Russia begins with them, they are the founders of of that great collective scientific work, which is continuously and successively continues from 1717 to the present day ... Schober and Messerschmidt were Germans, but they gave Russia all his life ... Their names must be remembered by us - the successors the work they started."

The German Catherine II kept Russia from German domination, from ruling over Russian Emperor Peter III, who wanted to be a "Prussian lieutenant". On the other hand, she also invited foreigners with manifestos of December 4, 1762 and July 22, 1763 settle in free places in Russia. Settlers from

Westphalia, Palatinate, Bavaria, Saxony, Swabia, Alsace-Lorraine. By the end of

the 19th century, almost one and a half million Germans lived with us. In one Volga region there was 190 German colonies. The German question in Russia had both pluses and minuses, but it was fact. Moreover, the fact is potentially positive, because the colonies were not cancerous tumors, but examples of smart housekeeping and smart living. They are not suppressed the Russians, but introduced something of their own into the general Russian process, something that Russia needed and useful.

As for the states, the allied Germany and Russia would complement each other friend in every way. And although the pan-Germanists looked at Ukraine, in Germany there were enough sober heads to understand: "Everyone has his own way."

At least in the Russian East.

In HIS practical foreign policy, Bismarck was far from always consistent conductor of its own principles. Well smart

the statesman should not be prevented by his principles from acting realistically, with taking into account the specific situation. And so Bismarck sometimes violently clashed with us, but this was not what determined his general line - the line of loyalty to Russia.

Russian thinker Nikolai Yakovlevich Danilevsky wrote well in his work "Russia and Europe" about England's eternal enmity towards us, about France's eternal readiness to stand up near Albion against Russian interests. As for Prussia, Danilevsky expressed unambiguously: "The task of this state, so brilliantly begun by it back in times of the Great Frederick, so brilliantly continued by him under the guidance of Bismarck, but far from finished, is, no doubt, in the unification of Germany, in

delivering political integrity and unity to the German people. This goal is unattainable without the help and assistance of Russia.

In general, Bismarck thought so too. When he was informed that Prince Wilhelm (the future emperor) wants to learn Russian, the chancellor grunted: "This is the most the best he can do." However, Bismarck owns the following words: "There are one boon for Germany, which even the mediocrity of German diplomats cannot to destroy is Anglo-Russian rivalry. Not the most loyal idea to Russia Bismarck, but here it is, that is. In addition,

the top of Russian society did not really welcome and encourage the strengthening of Germany ... And what about the narrow-minded courtiers - for the German revival with even such a subtle analyst as Fyodor Ivanovich Tyutchev glanced apprehensively.

People of practical business looked at many things more calmly ... So, in the 70s of the XIX century, the Krupp company, having received an order from the Prussian government for large-caliber guns, faced great difficulties. Russian artillery scientists, specialists in ballistics and gunpowder, helped to cope with them. And experienced shooting Krupp spent at the Okhtensky training ground ... After all, such an experience was not superfluous for Russia itself.

Alas, from such a trusting relationship with the Germans, we gradually moved into cloudy, foggy future ... Including therefore from the Bismarck line at the end of the 19th century Germany retreated more and more. Wilhelm II, despite the former lessons of the Russian language and Bismarck's warnings, appointed General Georg-Leo von Caprivi de Caprera di Montecuculi. And

the general tried to negotiate with England against the emerging Franco-Russian block. The Soviet "History of Diplomacy" believes that it was Caprivi who broke a "reinsurance" treaty with Russia, which pushed her into an alliance with France. But Caprivi was chancellor for three years - from 1891 to 1894, and the drift of the Second and Third Aleksandrov towards France began much earlier. Already in 1888 Russia "swallowed" the first French loan, so that the events were rearranged according to time: Caprivi could therefore drive a wedge between the Reich and Russia, because this is short-sighted tsarism itself helped.

However, not only tsarism... One interesting detail highlights this period very characteristically. Nikolai Karlovich Girs was of Swedish origin, but had a Russian soul. By the early nineties he turned seventy years old, and for almost ten years he sat in the chair of the Minister of Foreign Affairs Russia. He was smart, experienced and therefore advocated a cautious rapprochement with Germany. "Even the appearance that Russia is seeking the friendship of France would rather weaken than strengthen our positions," Girs reasoned.

He was, however, also bureaucratically obedient, and therefore he had to soon conclude a Franco-Russian pact, as demanded by Alexander III and the Russian (although far *not* Russian) exchange. To conclude in the following

circumstances... Practically all of the world's capital was afraid of a lasting Russo-German alliance, perhaps more than anything else. Such an alliance made it impossible to continental war in Europe, could frustrate many plans. resist the same military force would be very difficult for such an alliance. England and the United States did not have land armies, and France ...

Here is France, as the most concerned side, and rushed to process Russia in favor of concluding a direct *military* alliance *with it* . Naturally, against Germany. Even the slow-witted Alexander III hesitated. Girs' position was negative. The fate of many future profits hung in the gray air of May 1891 in St. Petersburg. And France more and more insistently wanted to be not only a usurer for Russia, but also her senior military leader.

As a creditor, the French Rothschilds promised to give Russia another loan. Through Russian Jews, they financed almost all railway construction in country and controlled most of the banking system. And suddenly ... Suddenly Alphonse Rothschild said that he would be happy to place in Europe a loan of Russian government, but "will not be able to do this until Russia stops the persecution unfortunate Jews. Considering that in Petersburg one Russian banker accounted for four bankers-tribesmen of Alphonse, then the claim was "justified", as speak. At

the same time, the Russian friends of the Parisian blackmailer were working on the tsar and hinted: now, they say, if Russia became a direct ally of France, then for an ally in the question of the loan could be relaxed.

Alexander still hesitated, and Gears was firm in his denial of the reasonableness of such step.

Then Rothschild terminated the loan agreement with the tsar, and ... And already in July 1891, the bearded autocrat, taking off his cap (so as not to give honor), listened to the Marseillaise. And the French squadron, invited on a "friendship visit", moored to the sounds of the revolutionary anthem at the forts of the monarchical Kronstadt.

Fifty girls were brought to French sailors under the command of Admiral Gervais bouquets of flowers. The idiotic Russian public yelled enthusiastically: "Vive la France!".

As a result, loans were received; in the summer of 1892, the first meeting of the chiefs of the Russian and French General Staffs, and in October 1893 the Russian the squadron arrived on a return visit to Toulon. Now the French public is relieved roared: "Vive la Russie!", And one of the Russian (Russians, right?) Correspondents reported to his newspaper: "I'm in some kind of daze. Where I am? What happened? What a magical stream combined all this into one feeling, into one mind? Can't you feel the presence of God here? love and brotherhood, the presence of something higher, ideal, descending on people only in high minutes "... The

presence of a certain god really took place here, but the god of profit and war, which was then clear only to those who started all this in the form of a future European massacre, turning into a world one. By the

beginning of 1894, the Franco-Russian military convention was signed and mutually ratified. Now, having started a war with France, Germany automatically received and war with Russia.

However, it was not easy to break Russian-German relations overnight. Enough to say that the first trade agreement between the two monarchies was concluded only at the end XIX century. Previously, there was no treaty, not because there was no trade, but because it was "kindred". Already very strong were mutual and dynastic, and economic ties.

Now, Alexander III allowed himself to intimidate Wilhelm II with the fact that he, they say, would flood Germany with Cossacks. In the mouth of the Russian emperor, who is not very prone to jokes, such threats made an impression on the Germans, as they say, indelible ... In addition the Germans did not forget about the "night cuckoo" factor. After all, the wife of Alexander III, that is The Russian empress was a Dane who was traditionally hostile to Germany.

In general, Russia was lucky not only for the "gray cardinals", but also for similar "gray "Cuckoos". For example, Alexander III made a sharp turn away from Berlin, and helped him in This is the Minister of Finance Sergei Yulievich Witte - the happy husband of a divorced Jewess Matilda Ivanovna Lisanevich (born either Khotimskaya or Nurok).

WITTE was also listed as a friend of the Parisian Rothschilds and the St. Petersburg banker Adolf Yulievich Rothstein, and these Rothsteins and Rothschilds twirled the policy of Russia as they wanted. On June 18, 1895, Count Lamzdorf, a longtime employee of Giers, entered in his diary: "Our ambassador is worried about the fate of our loan and assures that the French capitalists are not

not a kopeck will be given if the British or Germans participate in the loan. He attributes everything the evil of Agent Rothstein's premature disclosure of information; he talked with Rothschild even before applying to credit institutions ...".

And a month earlier, Lamzdorf had written: "The Parisian Rothschild refuses to negotiations for a partial loan, because he cannot do this without the London Rothschild."

Russia was left wondering: with which one - London or Paris - standing up, European Capital would talk down to her. However, Witte did not see nothing threatening. At

that time, the tsar changed in Russia: Alexander III died in Livadia in the autumn of 1894, and the throne passed to his son Nicholas II. Father in the official literature was called "Peacemaker", but laid the foundation for Russia's involvement in the war, which twenty years later Russia will receive already thanks to the son. Alas, in order to break the bonds tied by the father with France, Nikolai had neither will nor mind ... Vladimir

Karlovlch Lamzdorf believed that for Russia friendship with France "is like arsenic: in a moderate dose it is useful, and at the slightest exaggeration it becomes a poison. Witte and his trusted bankers thought otherwise, and Russia accepted French loans with suicidal desperation. But the same Witte was very firm with the Germans, and this provided us with customs wars with Germany and mutual losses. Witte fought the

Germans, demanding a reduction in duties on Russian bread. In the same time the Russian peasant was chronically malnourished, and a decrease in the export of bread would mean at least some satiety of the people. But then the profits of the landlords and grain speculators would decrease.

But Witte raised duties on the import of German cars, which contributed to maintaining our technical backwardness. In other words, the losses from Witte's "reforms" were mutual - both for Germany and for Russia ... As for relations with

the French, there were losses here too, but one-sided, for Russia alone. On June 1, 1895, Lamzdorf melancholy noted in his diary: "We spoiled our relations with neighboring Germany and for a more or less long time eliminated any possibility of common actions with her in conditions of trust; all this in order to please the French, who are trying to compromise us to the end, chain us only to an alliance with themselves and keep us dependent on their will.

Yes, the situation was not determined by the interests of Russia. Moreover, according to the exact expression of one a clever commentator on the activities of Lamzdorf and Giers, "the dishes were beaten by others."

However, in spite of everything, by the beginning of the 20th century, a third of Russian exports went to Germany: grain, sugar, meat, butter, timber. And a quarter of German exports - machinery, equipment, chemical products - went to Russia. Production equipment is not Chanel No. 5, not Coca-Cola. Industrial machines are the basis of sovereignty, and their supplied by Germany. Russian

sales of goods to Germany strengthened the Russian ruble, German sales to Russia developed the Russian economy and ensured the stable growth of the German economy. However less Witte slowed down the renegotiation of the Russian-German trade agreement, and ended the fact that the Kaiser in a personal letter suggested that Nicholas II put an end to the red tape.

The contract was extended, and the Germans provided us with a large loan, but in general policy it almost didn't change anything. Fans of helping the Russians to beat the German "pots" were added in Europe from all sides. Russia was deployed to France by very powerful forces inside and outside the

country. Lamzdorf was an intelligent man, but least of all he was a fighter. By 1905 this was expressed in his depressive statement in a letter to the ambassador in Paris, Nelidov: "In order to be on really good terms with Germany, you need an alliance with France. Otherwise, we will lose our independence, and I don't know anything harder than the German yoke."

Lamzdorf did not understand that the most terrible collar is the one that is harnessed for a trip to war. And France harnessed us to such a "collar". Moreover, at the same time, she behaved extremely

arrogantly after Russia's failures in the Russo-Japanese War. The same Nelidov warned officers of the General Staff Captains Polovtsev and Ignatiev, who arrived in Paris on official business trip: "Please note that the mot d'ordre (slogan) "La Russie ne compte plus!" ("WITH Russia is no longer considered).

THIS WAS THE MATTER ON THE EUROPEAN CONTINENT. But there was still England ... And very bad tendencies began to prevail there. Let's say from the time of a friend Rothschilds, Disraeli-Beaconsfield, in the political life of the British everything became more tangible Jewish *visible* participation, although the history of his *invisible* participation was leaving at least in the days of Oliver Cromwell.

This new political feature of English society manifested itself not only in lifetime role of Disraeli, but even more visibly - in his posthumous veneration. his day death, April 19, 1880, for decades became for the royal court and conservatives "Snowdrop Day" The deceased lord had a special respect for this flower.

The life publicist of Cecil Rhodes - the editor of the Johannesburg "Star" Monipenny - grieved for Disraeli only a little less than the life publicist of Disraeli himself - a long-term Times editor Buckley. What did all this mean for England on the eve of the new century?

Well, first of all, it meant the strengthening of transnational, that is, for England - anti-national, tendencies in foreign policy. What was beneficial to the London Rothschilds, it was beneficial to both the Rothschilds of Paris, and the Warburgs of Berlin, and Warburgs overseas. But far from always it was beneficial even for all English people. lords.

You can't even talk about the people.

By the way, Gilbert Keith Chesterton is not only the creator of the image of the father-detective Brown, but also an original philosopher - wrote: "Benjamin Disraeli rightly said that he is on the side of the angels. He was on the side of the angels - the fallen angels. He didn't stand for animal cruelty, but he stood for the imperialism of the princes of darkness, for their arrogance, mystery and contempt for the obvious good.

Let me remind you that the fallen angel of the Bible is

Satan ... As for Disraeli's words about alleged commitment to angels, his special piquancy the fact that the lord had taken their side at a time of tumultuous disputes caused by publication of Charles Darwin's On the Origin of Species. Then it was the lord it is stated that according to Darwin, a person is either an ape or an angel, and Disraeli himself is "on the side angels."

If we recall that the Devil is sometimes called the "monkey of God", then with the amendment Chesterton, this whole story takes on additional and not very funny depth.

The policy of the Princes of Darkness, the "monkeys of God", became the policy of Disraeli, and that became the policy of England. And that meant that the politics of the lords became politics Jewish cosmopolitan bankers.

Here is a curious story ... the Suez Canal, which cost 400 million francs and 20 thousand lives of Egyptian fellahs, was officially opened for navigation on November 17 1869. The canal project belonged to the Frenchman Lesseps, the French built the canal and predominantly the French owned it, to the extreme displeasure of England. Magpie four percent of the shares (176,600 out of 400,000) were owned by the Egyptian king - Khedive Ishmael Pasha.

Suez shares were "gold", and "suddenly" in 1875 Disraeli "suddenly finds out" that the Khedive is ready to sell his share of the shares to England. Purchase credits are available was to pass through Parliament without ruining the English treasury, but how could Disraeli forget about the Rothschilds! Money, instead of state interest-free financing, was taken under they allegedly have interest in order to speed up the

transaction. For 100 million francs, the British government first became a co-owner channel, and after the occupation of Egypt by the British in 1882, the channel became actually

English. The Soviet History of Diplomacy summarized: "Now ... control over channel was provided to the British government. So it is, but is it the government? Take, for example,

Count Archibald Philip Primrose Rosebery, an influential liberal leader. From 1892 to 1895 he was first Minister of Foreign Affairs, then Prime Minister of England. The count belonged to the group of "liberal-imperialists", was a supporter of repressive measures in South Africa against the Boers ... And these repressions ensured financial interests... Whom?

Yes,

all the same Rothschilds. And

I wish Rosebery didn't want a war with the Boers! At thirty, in 1878, he became a husband the only daughter of the all-powerful Rothschild of London Hanna. That's why after a half for a decade, Count Lamsdorf complained on May 22, 1895: "The Parisian Rothschild refuses to negotiate a partial loan because he cannot do it without a London Rothschild, and he, being a relative of Rosebery, has his own plans.

By the way, in addition to the London and Parisian Rothschilds, there were also the Viennese Rothschilds, and they controlled the economy of Austria-Hungary through the largest bank Credit-Anstalt. In 1895

the Rosebery cabinet fell, but the new Salisbury cabinet was also associated with Rothschilds, if not related, then friendly and business ties. And this Rothschild factor almost automatically fastened British politics to ... American. Yes, to the American one! Of course, deploy the heavy dreadnought of the English Isle to his former

the colony was a difficult and slow matter. But for the Rothschilds and Warburgs, it was a matter of absolutely necessary, because the North American continent, securely sheltered from military upheavals, has long been considered by them as the future main residence of the World Capital.

For British England, long-term normal (at least neutral) relations with Germany would be reasonable. For Rothschild England - absolutely invalid. The struggle between these two powerful tendencies determined the inconsistency and duality of British politics.

American Barbara Tuckman, who wrote an interesting book in 1962 about the beginning World War I "Guns of August" ("Guns of August"), believes that Germany could would have had an alliance with England if it had not rejected "the advances of the Minister of the Colonies, Joseph Chamberlain". The Soviet author of a book about Joseph and his sons, Lev Kertman, is convinced of the opposite: there could be no question of any consent, because, they say, Germany was Britain's "chief imperialist competitor".

Wrong here, I must say, both.

Kertman's thesis was expressed before him, by the way, by Academician Tarle. He also believed that the union Germany with England would inevitably make Germany a "soldier of England on the continent" with the prospect of a war against Russia insofar as Russia was supposedly bound by an alliance with France. If

Yevgeny Viktorovich proved anything here, then only how harmful and unnatural for Russia was its orientation towards France. After all, without an alliance with France, there could have been a sharp deterioration in relations with the

Germans. What about a possible alliance between the Germans and the British? Well, it wouldn't be the best for Russia option, but not fatal. Of course, with the Anglo-German "bundle" of Russia, for example, routes to Persia and somewhere else would be ordered ... So what? We

needed a

different path - into the depths of Russia, into the depths of ourselves ...

There were objective conditions for a rapprochement between England and Germany, but not on the base implied by Tuckman, and by Chamberlain himself. Chamberlain time after time believed that "a general agreement between Germany, England and America" was possible. However, only an agreement between England and Germany *against* America would make sense .

Be that as it may, England developed naturally. And although she grew stronger at the expense of colonies, but from her home she *herself* went out into the outside world. Germany also developed and grew stronger, using the internal forces, first of all, *of its own* people. It's possible I could also say about other peoples of the Earth,

except ... Except for two - Jewish, self-scattered around the planet, and American. America was created as a kind of "black hole", into which parts of different peoples, world resources and gold fell ... And America owed its success to foreign peoples at least no less than their own.

Some kind of life began across the ocean, but it did not help life so much the rest of humanity, how much she robbed and sucked on her. In return, this strange, unnatural "people" too often gave nothing but what crawled out of them.

"black hole" of hypocrisy, overgrown with gold and steel scales. Even the great

American discoveries that change a person's life for the better were often made in a purely

American manner: at random, but stubbornly and on a grand scale. Goodyear, for example, looking for method of vulcanizing rubber, I tried one and a half thousand options at random, up to mixing into soup mixes!

Yes, America grew into a great power and due to its own efforts, but ... But hardly can it be denied that England and Germany turned out to be the most developed countries in the world thanks to the qualities of the English and German peoples themselves. Both nations had the right say: "We developed our Motherland ourselves, even if we took the funds for this from others!". The American human "cocktail" could only pugnaciously declare: "And you all went to hell!", because America developed in artificial, hothouse and already therefore *not* natural. The

union of Anglo-German European naturalness against Jewish-American artificiality would provide a powerful potential for the development of a new world. But this kind of association was dangerous for supranational Capital, more and more intensifying.

But what about

Russia? Russia, which is developing, albeit slowly, with delays and miscalculations, but developing also due to natural, internal factors, could become in the Anglo-German world that third pillar that would finally give stability to true progress of mankind. Another

sequence was also possible: first a German-Russian alliance, then annexation of England. And if there was in such a possible scenario the "fourth superfluous, so this is France. Although France could find its worthy place.

We are talking here, of course, about the capitalist union, but with the implementation of the common European bloc, even in the capitalist format, the world could develop towards prosperity, because such a bloc would exclude a European war, being, moreover, objectively anti-American. That

was the rub! The stupid policy

of Russia also interfered with the matter - stupid as in relation to strength European world, and in relation to the future of Russia.

When Chamberlain was groping for the possibility of an alliance with the Reich, Wilhelm II announced English proposal to Nicholas II and asked what he could get in return from Russia, if he refuses the "English version". It was clear that Wilhelm wanted to know whether Russia will move away from orientation towards France.

Alas, the tsar's advisers almost without exception spoke a mixture of Nizhny Novgorod with French, so that there was no Russian positive reaction to the Kaiser's letter

followed. And Wilhelm here, it seems, did not deceive his soul, because he was drawn to Russia ... No wonder even Bismarck during his chancellorship was dissatisfied with too frequent Wilhelm's visits to the Russian court.

The pro-French-anti-German line of Russian policy gradually became stronger. AND all the same Tarle was later sure that the king did the right thing, he didn't fall for the bait German cousin ... And the Germans, they say, are seriously about the German-English complex (that is, according to Tarle, conspiracy) against Europe and did not think, because, they say, in this case Germany became a continental mercenary of the Britons. Well-u-u ... How

to know,

how to know If the tsar

had come to an agreement with the Kaiser or did not interfere with the rapprochement of Germany and England, then even an Anglo-German alliance could only mean the isolation of France, not war Germany against her. At the same time, Russia would also benefit from strengthening relations with Germans, and benefit from the role of "arbitrator", because, having "rebuilt" from France, Russia would find itself in the position of a natural arbiter - the regulator of the European situations. Russia could become the "axis" on which the yoke of the European balance, where the German and English "bowls" of the "scales" would fluctuate.

In other words, any alliance that would be sealed by Russian-German handshake, would mean European peace, belittling France, limiting initiative England and German hegemony in Europe. Why not? Germany deserved it It wouldn't hurt Russia. On

the contrary, it would be beneficial for

us! The unnatural but mighty forces of *seeming* progress resisted such possible future both consciously and instinctively. And their resistance was that more successfully, the more disagreements arose between the great European peoples.

Anglo-German contradictions were, of course, evident. If before the "workshop world" was considered to be England, but now this definition was more suitable for Germany. German exports grew so rapidly that by the end of the 19th century, the surprise of the British, mixed with annoyance, was replaced by - by their own admission - panic. The British interfered with the Germans in Turkey, and the Germans to them in South Africa. And such conflict points multiplied like a rash: the Far East, China, Istanbul and Baghdad...

Distances on the globe remained the same, but speeds increased dramatically movement of people, goods, weapons and information. A conflict between two neighbors arise thousands of miles away and become known in the capitals of the warring parties later than a day later. And since the British Empire was universal, and the German Reich aspired to the same thing, then they constantly collided foreheads.

The Pan-German alliance was decidedly anti-English (it was true, in general, configured "anti-..." in relation to any country other than its own), and the London The Saturday Review was no less categorical: "Germany must be destroyed"...

All this is so. However, objectively, the main imperialist competitor of both England and Germany was still the United States. Of course, England could

have tried to decisively weaken Germany by pushing her against France, but then she found herself face to face with America, reliably protected ocean from military attack. And this meant in the long term the loss of England's powerful status.

Of course, Germany could assert itself in Europe and beyond by the power of the sword. But, at the end in the end, she, remaining alone, would lose to the same distant America, not wasting forces in the exhausting fever of war.

America was overseas. Germany and England were separated from each other by almost arm's length, almost a pistol shot. Their conflict could easily escalate into mutual destruction. The option is not the most reasonable from any point of view.

Alas, just the mind (not even humanistic, but practical, far-sighted)
the British and Germans were not enough, although they more than once entered into negotiations and even concluded temporary agreements. One day, March 29, 1898, Joseph Chamberlain was talking to by the German ambassador, Count Paul von Gatzfeld, took place in ... a London house banker Rothschild. But this did not change anything in the main thing - the European situation was gradually promoted to war on the territory of Europe, which has already forgotten what it is - war.

And could Rothschild be sincere in the role of a peacemaker? He could only play this role play like an actor. Everything was explained here by tactics, and not by a profit-making strategy.

The Rothschilds are the South African gold and diamond industry. Large Birmingham industrialist Joseph Chamberlain - the second person in the office after the prime minister Salisbury - was associated with her. So, willy-nilly, with the same Rothschilds.

Lord (lord, reader!) Rothschild became the patron of the ruthless enthusiast "Empire of the stomach" by Cecil Rhodes and one of the founders of the British South African companies. It was almost a state with its banner, coat of arms, postage stamps. But Rothschild's commercial "empire" was hindered by the independence of the Boer republics. On

the Boer Transvaal and its President Kruger were pressed both politically and by force of arms. Germany had its own calculation for Africa, and Wilhelm II supported the Boers. His telegram of welcome to Kruger after the unsuccessful British raid on the Transvaal

made a lot of noise in Europe. "The nation will never forget this telegram," exclaimed English "Morning Post", as if Wilhelm did not congratulate people who defended their freedom, but enslavers. But

at that moment, Rothschild had to urgently negotiate with the Germans, and his Chamberlain's companion minister proved to be an excellent option. Moreover, the matter converged like a wedge not only in Africa. Interests of the shareholder of the Royal Company Niger" Chamberlain were in conflict with the French colonialists, who interfered and the Germans. And, besides, Chamberlain's closest ally in the cabinet, the Duke of Devonshire, was concerned about the state of China, because the Chinese market was operated textile workers of Lancashire, and in these textiles the duke's capital was invested. The situation Germany in China was very strong.

With such interweaving of vested interests, temporary alliances were inevitable, and such "high state considerations" could not be ignored ministers either of His Majesty the King, or of His Might of Capital. And this gave "high politics" and "higher state interests" additional ambiguity and inconsistency. For example,

at the beginning of the 20th century, Rhodes and the Rothschilds decided to carry out and carried out victorious war with the Boers. But now Germany took it calmly.

Why?

Yes, because "in exchange" the English financial tycoons did not mind plans of Deutsche Bank and the German government to build the Baghdad railway and to strengthen German influence in Turkey.

The German Siemens goes to Constantinople-Istanbul with his daughter, and goes with them to company and daughter of Joseph Chamberlain. On March 10, 1899, the worst enemy of the Boers arrives in Berlin Cecil Rhodes, and Kaiser Wilhelm favorably accepts him ...

Nothing particularly new here, however, was not. Selfishness of possessive "top" was inseparable from them from time immemorial. Only the scale of possibilities has changed for this selfishness. The Roman patrician was no less greedy than Joseph Chamberlain or The Rothschilds, straddling all European capitals. However, the ability to satisfy the unbridled desires of the Roman elite were immeasurably less than those of the elite new time. Could not compete with the Rothschilds, Rothsteins, Rhodes and Rockefellers and all crowned Louis and Charles of the 17th and 18th centuries. So new scope changed society beyond recognition. The strategic goal has not changed - a constant and

maximum benefit. Tactical means also remained the same - temporary alliances. But a *strategic tool* loomed before unprecedented: the World War. And soon enough. An accurate look saw her before Capital himself

came to the idea of her. December 15

1887 Engels wrote in London the words that Lenin called thirty years later prophetic. Well, not in all, but in the main predictions, Engels was really scientifically accurate: "For Prussia-Germany, no other war is already possible now, except world war. And it would be a war of unprecedented size, unprecedented strength. From eight to ten million soldiers will choke each other and eat the whole Europe. The devastation caused by the Thirty Years' War, condensed in three to four years and spread over the entire continent, famine, the confusion of our artificial mechanism in trade, industry and credit, the collapse of the old states and their routine statesmanship, such a collapse that dozens of crowns are lying on the pavement. Takova perspective, if the system of competition in military weapons taken to an extreme will finally bring its inevitable results. That's where, gentlemen kings and statesmen men, your wisdom has brought old Europe."

These were not the naive reasons of Debidur - "the ambition of any dynasty or thoughtless impulse of the people", but insight into the essence. And even more penetration. remarkable that the serious Englishman Henry Noel Brailsford, even in March 1914 in In his book *The War of Steel and Gold*, he wrote: "The era of conquest in Europe is over; and if not consider the Balkans and, perhaps, the outskirts of the Austrian and Russian empires, then you can to say with the greatest possible certainty in politics that the boundaries of our modern nation-states are definitively established. Personally, I believe that there will be no more wars between the six great powers." What,

cheers for Engels? Of

course, but ... But

Engels was unfair to Germany: no war, except for a world war, was already impossible for England, France, and especially for America. Engels died on August 5 1895 and, having correctly predicted the future world war, simply did not have time to become witnessed the explosive growth of American industrial power, which was rapidly changing former world political "alignment". As a result, it turned out that by the beginning of the 20th century Germany did not seek war in the first place. On the other

hand, tsarist Russia stupidly climbed into the world squabble, but it only supplemented the general picture. Although Russia had an inherent feature only to it: it was obviously was considered as a "gray cattle" for "slaughter". And many have tried to do so.

For example, in the Russian historical tradition, Witte is considered a major and patriotic. At the same time, they also refer to Lenin, although here is Lenin's exact assessment activities of Sergei Yulievich: "Russia has already seen a brilliant budget (under Witte). Same there was "free cash", there was also boasting to Europe, also reinforced obtaining loans from the European bourgeoisie. And as a result? Crash."

Crash is the right word. Before the war, in 1914, Russia only to pay French shareholders of regular loan coupons needed half a billion francs in year! In order to pay off, new loans were arranged. Interest increased by interest, the private French banks withdrew their commissions, the French press, which advertised the loans, theirs. The total amount of Russia's debt to France reached 27 billion francs... But little money reached the national

economy of Russia. Yes, and the economy was not impressive,

no matter what anyone said about the powerful de

"progress" of Russia at the beginning of the 20th century. Published in New York in 1988 Boris Brazol's brochure "The Reign of Emperor Nicholas II in Figures and Facts". Author tried to prove that after the revolution, Russia was allegedly in decline: even iron roads were built only a thousand kilometers a year, and under the king - 1575 kilometers each!

But in 1917, the operational length of railways in Russia was 70.3 thousand kilometers, and in 1945 - 112.9 thousand kilometers. Twenty five years after Civil War and the Great Patriotic War, the average annual increase was more than 1600 kilometers per year. And this is not counting the access roads of industrial organizations and enterprises.

By 1940, cargo turnover had grown by almost 6 times, passenger turnover - by 3.3 times ... And the new station management? What about bridges? And thousands of kilometers through the tundra, desert, taiga? And *what about newly* built roads after the war on the site of those destroyed?

Brazol reported that the "royal" kilometer of the railway was allegedly cheaper "Soviet" - only 74 thousand rubles. But the "Statistical Collection of the Ministry of Railways for 1913" gave the price of a kilometer at 117.3 thousand rubles for 1910 and 123.4 thousand rubles for 1913. However, the royal roads were really relatively inexpensive, because they were bad: light rails, weak ballast, bad sleepers ... The main thing is

that tsarist Russia generally did not build so many cities, domains, hospitals, residential buildings. She became more and more entangled in the web of external and internal bloodsuckers. And although the offices and offices of these financial "spiders" were located on different sides of the state border, both of their varieties were equally alien to Russia and her interests.

Witte is sometimes credited with the introduction of gold circulation in Russia. But practically this was done by Witte invited from Austria-Hungary A. Yu. Rotshtein - one of implementers of this idea there. And the price of this idea is visible from the words of the State Comptroller Peter Khristoforovich Schwanebach: "The transition to gold circulation has taken place with us chiefly by accumulating gold by foreign loans. Maintain such "Success" was only possible with new loans.

What worked? Russia's gold reserves seemed to be solid. Gold backing paper money was about 120%! And as a result, the West ... sucked out Russian gold, and there were not enough funds for lending to the national industry. All this was it is so obvious that the opinions of Lenin and Schwanebach, as we see, practically coincided.

At the same time, Lenin wrote about the official publicist Guryev from the government officialdom "Russia". The Zemshchina newspaper defined him as a "publicist with a Jewish liberal tinge," and Lenin scoffed: "Is it possible that the official "Russia" is Jewish liberal body?

Lenin explained: the actual State Councilor Guryev was the personal secretary of Witte. And the editor of "Russia", by the way, was a former professor of law Demidovsky lyceum... Ilya Yakovlevich Gurlyand.

So the shade was still determined correctly.

The name WITTE is often associated with the growth of railways and less often with the growth of drunkenness on Rus'. But it was he (is it true, is he the only one?) who carried out an interesting financial and social innovation with a government monopoly on vodka. Here is how hereditary described its consequences monarchist V. V. Shulgin: "The pictures played out in front of the monopoly shops were disgusting. Previously, people drank in taverns and taverns. There they sat at tables and something to eat. And after all, they not only yelled drunk songs, but sometimes they even talked. The tavern was somewhat of a club, albeit a low-brow one. After the reform of the tavern closed. Vodka consumers drank it straight from the neck on the street and, drunk, lay right there

"... So, before Witte, the common man had a place to drink and eat. After Witte, you can there was only *"get drunk"*. I note in brackets that approximately according to the same scheme in post-Stalinist USSR from some point banned the use of alcohol in canteens. The social result of this measure was very reminiscent of "Witte's". Through the efforts of Witte, the budget

became more and more parasitic and filled at the expense of not so much an increase in production as "drunken" income. Wine net income

monopoly increased from 188 million rubles in 1900 to 675 million in 1913 and amounted to about 30% of the revenue of a truly "drunk" budget. Former

Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of Finance of the Russian Empire Vladimir Nikolayevich Kokovtsov writes in his memoirs how, in the spring of 1913, Witte at one time fooled him with a certain project of sobering up Russia, but so no did not present the project. But at the end of the year erupted in the State Council on this about a "purely hysterical, - according to Kokovtsov, - speech", ending it with a heart-rending "Sentry!" ...

Sergei Yulievich's speech was, of course, pure camouflage and was clearly intended "for history": they say, it was not Witte who made Russia drunk, he wanted to "sober up" her.

"This word" guard, "Kokovtsov recalled," was uttered in such a frantic, shrill voice that the entire State Council literally came to an undisguised bewilderment not from the impression made, but from the unexpectedness of the trick, from shamelessness of speech "...

Perhaps, in this brief sketch from nature, Witte's personality is outlined to a funny exactly. Sergey Yulievich was a chameleon in life, in politics, in views. Perhaps it is this absolute shamelessness of his, combined with a quick mind and noble origin attracted the attention of the Jewish bourgeois elite in Russia already at early stages of the career of the future Count "Polusakhalinsky". After all, Witte came to Russia's state policy with private service in the joint-stock company of the South Western Railways. And the Russian railways are the Jewish magnates Bliokh, Gunzburgs, Varshavsky, Polyakovs ... During his long career, Witte more than once entered

into visible conflicts with Jewish business circles (with the same Polyakov), but without the closest and warmest with them cooperation, his career simply would not have taken place.

Moreover, if you follow the path of adventurous assumptions, then Witte's breakthrough to higher floors of the official bureaucratic ladder can be regarded as a cunning multi-way a combination of the Jewish elite to infiltrate the state "tops" of the Russian empire of "his little man". Sergei Yulievich himself played a role in this combination a pawn advanced confidently by an experienced queen player.

Witte took off in life instantly. Graduated from the Faculty of Mathematics Novorossiysk University in Odessa (!), he almost immediately began to serve in private railways. In 1888, the thirty-nine-year-old Witte was the manager of the South Western Railways, where Blioch was chairman of the board.

Emperor Alexander III himself often traveled along these roads from St. Petersburg to the Crimea and back. The lettered royal train ran at courier speeds. Went from year to year, and no incidents happened to him ... And here ... The story of what

happened next is absolutely reliable, it is taken from the memoirs of Witte.

In the service, he had to accompany letter trains, but to the person of the emperor were not allowed. All that Sergei Yulievich could see was Alexander's worn-out pants, which the tsar's valet Kotov patched at night (the tsar did not like renovations and wore out his clothes to decay). The

service went on as usual, and no one paid much attention to the employee Blioch. paid. Moreover, even with Witte "on board", the trains did not slow down. And suddenly...

Suddenly, in August 1888, Witte, the road manager, begins categorically demand a reduction in the speed of the imperial train, because otherwise he does not guarantee security. It would seem, if in doubt, carry out the necessary road work. But no, Witte demands a reduction in speed, and the Minister of Railways, Admiral Posyet, has to redo the schedule of movement, increasing it by three hours. As a result, in Fastov on Witte directly addressed the highest displeasure. At first, however, it is transmitted the head of the tsarist guard, General Cherevin, but Witte begins to object to Cherevin in tones

excessively loud. And then...

And then Alexander III himself comes out of the salon and interrupts the "zealous campaigner": - What are you talking about. I drive on other roads, and no one slows me down, but you cannot drive on your road simply because your road is Jewish.

Witte fell silent, but Posyet spoke: - Your road, my dear, is not in order. On other roads, we drive fast, and no one does not dare to take the sovereign slowly. And

then Witte rose up: -

You know, Your Excellency, let others do what they want, but I don't want to break the sovereign emperor's head, because it will end with you being such you will break the head of the sovereign!

And it was fulfilled according to Witte's word! Two months have passed. The term is sufficient so as not to arouse unnecessary suspicion, but not enough for Witte's "zeal" to forgotten. And on October 17, 1888, near the Borki station near Kharkov (of course, not on "Wittevskaya" South-Western, and on the "foreign" Kharkov-Nikolaev road) a train with Alexander III and his family flew down a slope ... Witte,

who was appointed one of the experts, describing this incident, composed a whole an epic about how the hero-emperor held the roof of a dining car on his back, saving his family and servants. This picturesque picture wanders from book to book, but in reality, the royal family, together with the emperor, was saved by the fact that the walls of the car moved "house" and delayed the fall of the roof.

Witte's expert opinion as a whole turned out to be no less picturesque. It was so inaccurate that neither Alexander Fedorovich Koni, who came from Petersburg, nor the director of the Kharkov Technological Institute, process engineer and professor of mechanics Viktor Lvovich Kirpichev. Witte

disputed Kirpichev's opinion in print, declaring that he "does not know railway practice. But the engineering instinct of Witte's opponent was, as they say, in the genes. The Kirpichevs are a whole dynasty of scientists and engineers. Brother Mikhail is a chemist, an employee of Mendeleev. Brother Nil - general, professor at the Nikolaev Military Engineering Academy, and in Soviet times - a teacher at the Military Engineering Academy named after V. V. Kuibyshev. Son Mikhail is a Soviet scientist, heating engineer, academician. So about the "incompetence" of Kirpichev, Sergei Yulievich cast a shadow on the October day.

However, the deed was done - Alexander remembered the "shrew" - "seer", without an ax chopping the truth in the eyes of the king. And ... Witte was offered the post of director Department of Railway Affairs of the Ministry of Finance. Maybe,

however, the tsar was *reminded* of Witte, and about the post *prompted*. After all, for some reason, such an engineering prophet was not identified in the Ministry of Railways (Ministry of Railways), but to *finance*.

From this it went ...

Witte, who was associated with the Jewish financial and industrial capital, turned out to be so in its place (for this capital) that involuntarily think about it: wasn't it too *opportunely* played out first in Fastov, and then under Borkami this "career-catastrophic" story? A similar "pocket" Witte is needed was blioam to the point: a grandiose railway was unfolding in Russia construction, and unclean raking hands could be heated on it better than on anything else. And the risk for the royal

family? Well, Alexander would have died, Tsarevich Nikolai would have died - just think! The trouble is not great, the king would somehow be found a new one. But to advance "to kings", and even immediately from pawns to queens of such a "statesman" as Witte? This - It's not easy, but it's rewarding. N-yes...

"Trickstered" Witte at the posts of Minister of Finance and Prime Minister a lot. He deprived, for example, of loans from the State Bank the most healthy financially industrial groups of von Derviz, Alchevsky, Mamontov. And in 1899, at the suggestion of Witte the so-called "Mammoth case" of Savva Ivanovich Mamontov, a Russian philanthropist and chairman of the board of the Moscow-Yaroslavl-Arkhangelsk road society. Mamontov started a new major railway project in the North - a matter for Russia is extremely useful. Witte at first pretended to support him, and then he himself "sank", depriving support. Moreover, he initiated a criminal case against the Mamontov company case. They were acquitted by a jury, but this did not save them from ruin. At the same time a promising economic project for the development of the Russian North was also buried. In Russia they said directly that the machinations of Jewish bankers were behind the collapse of Mamontov.

Witte's defenders tried to prove that, they say, "investment promotion economy through government subsidies has logical limits", they say, should act mechanisms of self-regulation. But even these "logical limits" in Russia were far from achieved. At the same time, subsidies were sought for blithely.

Witte portrayed himself as a champion of "honest business", but the Perm-Kotlas railway (part of that St. Petersburg-Vologda-Vyatka line, which he did not allow to be built Mamontov) was later built by a relative of Witte's wife, engineer Bykhovets. And to replace Mamontov, on the board of the Arkhangelsk-Yaroslavl road, came to another of her relatives, the doctor Levi. For a

long time, Witte also managed the Ministry of Railways. Released in the light in 1989 of the political biography of Witte, written by the historian A.V.

in the hands of the state by buying out private roads and state-owned railway construction".

And here is the result of this "noble" work for the benefit of the state. In Germany, by 1913, the state-owned railway network accounted for 94% of the total, and in Russia - only 67%. German roads were unprofitable, and Russian ones were unprofitable. But profitable only for treasury. As for private shareholders, in 29 years - from 1885 to 1913 - they received almost 4 billion rubles of net income.

Gold.

Such was Witte's "statesman" and "Slavophile" (as he is some biographers on the grounds that in his youth he embossed a couple of newspaper articles Aksakov "Rus" and enrolled in the "Holy Squad" of Count Shuvalov, from which, having sworn allegiance, he quickly left).

Much later, in the preface to the memoirs of her late husband, Matilda Ivanovna Isaakovna Witte-Nurok complained: "At court, among conservatives, among liberals, in democratic circles - everywhere they looked at Count Witte as a "stranger". He sought the good of his homeland, following his own paths, and therefore had few permanent fellow travelers."

So, he was looking for good, he had huge opportunities for doing good, but fellow travelers on he had few ways of serving the Motherland. That is, only Count Witte about Russia was concerned, and next to him there was another guardian who understood him - Countess Matilda. About Rothstein and The Rothschilds, for whom Witte was not a stranger, the Countess did not mention, presumably, solely out of jealousy. Witte turned out to be a

genius of opportunism, helpfulness and guessing "where the wind blowing." And how firmly this ideal chameleon bound himself from a young age precisely with international Jewish financial circles, showed better than many who in Russia is more and more imperiously and self-servingly "orders the music".

And this is not an unfounded assertion, reader. Like on the eve of the First World War described the change in the internal Russian situation since the beginning of the 80s of the XIX century "Jewish antiquity": "A complete metamorphosis took place in people from the Pale of Settlement:

the farmer turned into a banker, the contractor into a high-flying entrepreneur, and their employees - in the capital's dandies. A phalanx of stockbrokers formed, producing colossal air circulation. One St. Petersburg Jewish old-timer admired: "What was Petersburg? Desert; now it's Berdichev!"..."

And here's another piece of evidence, so interesting that I'll just cite an excerpt from memoirs of Count Ignatiev "Fifty years in the ranks", referring to 1896:

"On one of the regiment's duties (*Ignatiev had just joined the cavalry guards*. - S.K.) the non-commissioned officer on duty ran up to me and with excitement in his voice reported that "Alexander Ivanovich died." Alexander Ivanovich everything, from private to regiment commander, they called the old bearded sergeant major who stood for hours next to orderly at the gate, regularly saluting all those passing by.

Where did Alexander Ivanovich come to us from? Turns out it was in the early 70s. the stoves in the regiment smoked incredibly, and no one could cope with them; like a military district sent a stove-maker from the Jewish cantonists to the regiment (*military pupils, obliged later serve*. - S.K.), Oshansky. With him, the stoves burned regularly, but without him they smoked. All they firmly knew this and, bypassing all the rules and laws, they detained Oshansky in the regiment, giving him uniform, titles, medals and distinctions for extra-long "immaculate service". And here it is not became...

I had no idea what happened in the next few hours. To the regimental Luxurious sleighs and carriages drove up to the gates, from which elegant elegant ladies in furs and respectable gentlemen in top hats; they all made their way to the cellar, where the body of Alexander Ivanovich. It turned out - and this could not have occurred to any of us - that Sergeant Major Oshansky had been at the head of the St. Petersburg Jewish community for many years. On the next morning, towards noon, the regimental arena took on an unusual appearance. Apart from everything Jewish Petersburg, not only all available officers of the regiment gathered here, but also many old cavalry guards led by all former regiment commanders. At Alexander's tomb Ivanovich, the aristocratic military world was mixed with the Jewish trade and financial. After the rabbi's speech, the coffin of the old cantonist was raised by six former regiment commanders ... Such was the solemn ending of the old story about smoking stoves.

Ignatiev himself saw in the story he told only a funny curiosity, but, as you know, there is no smoke without fire. Guards stoves "smoke", and then live a quarter of a century could not do without Oshansky, presumably, not in vain. It looks like someone really needed to behind the "smoke screen" of the guards' stoves for decades, an inconspicuous, but, as we see, by no means an insignificant figure. And the picture Ignatiev involuntarily painted rather sinister than funny. Imperial St. Petersburg was truly becoming New Berdichev. The head of the Lena gold mining

partnership is the son of a baron Evzel Gunzburg Horace Gunzburg and Horace's son Gabriel. In 1908 to the Russian such a peculiar "Englishman" as Baron James de Hirsch and his banking house are connected to gold mining. Hirsch is also operating in South Africa, which means: together with Rothschilds.

The powerful Muscovite Samuil Polyakov (whose daughter was married to de Hirsch), as well as a Parisian (former Petersburger) banker baron Jacques Ginzburg.

Dmitry Rubinstein (Rasputin's Mitka) becomes the banker of Alix, the last Empress of New Berdichev. And since 1891 unofficial, and since 1894 already official agent of the Russian Ministry of Finance in France for many years (up to the war itself and later) becomes a real Privy Councilor (rank II class!), Cavalier Order of the White Eagle, French financier Arthur Rafalovich.

However, the Rafalovich directly Russian land is also not without good deeds left: in Odessa there was a banking house "Rafalovich and sons". best friend Rafalovich was the landowner Abaza, whose nephew "organized" Russia's war with

Japan.

Returning to Witte, we can summarize: not respecting and not recognizing the new "Berdichev's" hypostasis of the "city of Petrov", not a single financier - either private or state - would not have sat in his place for a long time. On the other hand, it was impossible for the emerging alliance of New Berdichev, Paris and London not to involve the Russian in the planned European war. peasant as a small bargaining chip to pay for large combinations.

Chapter 3. Russia and Germany - from cooperation to discord

COMBINATIONS were conceived seriously and seriously. That war is only continues politics by other means, the world has known since Clausewitz. Future world war was also, of course, a means. And as such she should have perform three tasks at once.

It was necessary, say, to bring down the social tension that was growing in Europe, and in America. But this is in the third place, however.

Secondly, the war was supposed to give unprecedented dividends. special profitability for the Capital of military government orders is well explained American publicist Hersh Meyer: "Even when 75-90 percent The company's production capacity is used for civilian production and only 10-25 percent - for military orders, it is the latter that play a decisive role for entrepreneurs. Civilian products cover the cost of materials, depreciation, wages, salaries of employees, rent, and so on. And the military production gives a net excess profit.

That's right, because a special, *non-market* consumer pays here. military prices products are determined not by cost, but by the possibilities of the treasury. The treasury of the same developed states became bottomless due to the buildup of public debt. The creditors were ordinary taxpayers, only the interest on the debt was paid

not to them, but to themselves.

Blood ...

However, even superprofits played a secondary role, and first of all, the war was seen as her organizers as a means of exhausting America's European competitors and America to the forefront of world politics.

What about the redistribution of the world? After all, it is believed that the First World War was fought for a new redistribution world, to which Germany was rushing ...

Well, German aspirations manifested themselves outwardly most clearly, but they were not decisive. Yes, the young Reich, like a good German black pudding with cumin, turned out to be stuffed with the ideas of aggressive pan-Germanism in half with the mighty Krupp twelve inch barrels. Just look at the old photo panorama gun shop of the tenth years at the Krupp plant, where these steel "trunks" "are only within sight there are fifty to understand how much the war for capital Germany was a done deal. But resolved if the old colonial powers will not cede part of the planetary production amicably to them by opening colonial markets both for German exports and imports.

Germany's appetites were considerable, but they could hardly be called exorbitant: the appetite was according to the economic organism of the Reich, which was rapidly growing and in need of raw materials and

markets. Even without war, the Germans actively conquered the world with their ability to work. That's how Russian diplomat Nikolai Nikolaevich Shebeko reported in 1911 to the Foreign Ministry about plans development of the Baghdad railway: "In its present phase, the track under construction is already an excellent market for the products of German factories and plants, since the entire iron building material is delivered from Germany. In the future finished form the road will enable German industry to flood with its products Asia Minor, Syria and Mesopotamia, and at the end of the line Baghdad - Khanekin - Tehran also Persia. The

Germans, unlike the British, paved these paths to the East not with cannon fire and steel swords, and with fire a domain and rail steel! The pan-German ideology had convincing material justification.

Academician Tarle spoke of the power of the Entente in only superlative degrees: "The combined forces of the Entente were so colossal, its material capabilities were

so limitless ... ", etc. However, statistics spoke of the opposite ... In 1913, the share of the Reich (excluding Austria-Hungary) in world engineering was 21.3 percent. And the whole Entente: Great Britain, France and Russia, together taken - 17.7 percent. The result for Germany is impressive, but... But it pales in front of the strength of the United States, which had 51.8 percent! There were other statistics as well. In 1900 almost 75% of American exports went to Europe, and in 1913 - only 59%! And the main reason was the strengthening of Germany. It turned out that because of the Germans, US capital was losing its influence in Europe at a rate of more than one percent a year! But

Uncle Sam had a serious "handicap": he did not have to spend a lot on the maintenance of the armed forces, the construction of "defensive ramparts", "lines", fortresses. Finally, to waging devastating wars over the centuries ... Actually, these numbers and considerations programmed everything in advance: geography, the course and outcome of the First Great Divide of the World and Obtaining Superprofits by War.

The line of reasoning here was simple and vile... Let's start with geography... In the 20th century, a war could be serious and large-scale only in Europe between Europeans. And with the obligatory participation of Germany, which has already passed through one-fifth of the world's modern production. But the only Germany's traditional rival on the European continent was France, and France could not stand the war with Germany one on one. So, to France it was necessary fasten the third major continental power, Russia, in advance.

Britain was supposed to shoot down the anti-German complot, but carefully, presenting itself for the time being, as a side rather neutral. The United States

should have won the war ... As a country that gives half of the world production of modern products, it was quite suitable for the role final arbiter. But what

about free-spirited cowboys and farmers? With not forgotten will America's industrial workers, not to mention the "middle" class? For all problems outside the star-striped homeland, they all did not care deeply. Show off with carbines at his side: in Mexico, in Cuba - wherever it went. And pull them out into the distance Europe for the Great War - such that the Profit turned out with a capital letter, in the world scale was not easy. Almost impossible. This

means that it was necessary to start and wage war by proxy, but under the American control. There was no alternative, the war must begin with the hands of the Germans and the French with attracting the peasants of the unintelligent "Admiral Marquis Puddle and Tsushima Strait" by Nikolai Alexandrovich Romanov. The peasants will distract the "Teutons", then the Britons will join ... On the "pickup" - Austrians, Italians, Turks, Serbs, etc., but this so, by the way ... When

the Europeans wear each other to a pulp and get bogged down in debt to America, you can always find a reason to join the war and "one hundred percent Yankees", like this predicted more than a hundred years before the beginning of the 20th century, the perspicacious and cunning Charles Maurice Talleyrand, Prince of Benevent, a diplomat of all French governments from the end XVIII century to the beginning of the 30s of the XIX century ...

The organizers of the war were clear in advance both its course and outcome. And it's strange that it was denied by such, for example, the greatest specialist in the era as Academician Tarle. He wrote: "Of course, for the capitalist classes of all countries, especially all the great powers, there was an element of risk; no one had a mathematically indisputable hope of victory"... Tarle is fundamentally wrong here. As for the United States (and only the United States!), then they had something more in that war than hopes of victory. US risk was reduced to zero in advance, but the victory was calculated with a mathematically indisputable accuracy.

There was no doubt in advance that in the event of war, Germany would be the Entente beat. And that the United States will begin to support the Entente at first "after the fact", without direct entry into the war. But when Germany almost beats the Entente, the United States will intervene already openly and bring the final balance. To your advantage. Tarle

did not understand the essence of the plan of the First World War even after the war, but the cunning, insightful fox Talleyrand, after observing America from close, gave an accurate forecast future one hundred and twenty years before the actual events and warned: "To America Europe must always look with open eyes and give no pretext for accusations or reprisals. America is getting stronger every day. She will turn into great force, and the moment will come when, in the face of Europe, communication with which will become easier as a result of new discoveries, she will wish to have her say on our affairs and lay their hands on them ... On the day America comes to Europe, the world and security will be banished from it for a long time."

That is exactly what happened, but it all had to be well prepared. After all had to deal not with tin soldiers, but with the fate of a good half a billion living people.

And it was NECESSARY to isolate Germany from Russia and at the same time not to give Germany to put up with England. In this dual task, the enemies of the European world have succeeded quite. There were many of them, but among them there is one particularly mysterious figure. Secrets long preparations for the war manifested themselves in it so clearly that, in fact, they ceased to be secrets. This case is so unique that it needs to be dealt with separately.

I mean the most - by the definition of the first edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedias of 1930 - a major representative of behind-the-scenes diplomacy in the era Wilhelm II Baron Friedrich August von Holstein. This name is

almost unfamiliar to modern Soviet historiography and from subsequent publications of the TSB "fell out" (which is surprising and mysterious in itself). About Holstein mentions Academician Khvostov in the second volume written by him in the early sixties "History of Diplomacy", but he does not emphasize the true meaning of the mysterious baron. However, modern Western historians, for some reason, also lose sight of the baron. Holstein was born in the year of Pushkin's death - in 1837. He started as the closest an employee of Bismarck, and much later actively contributed to his resignation.

At the age of twenty-three, Holstein came to St. Petersburg as a junior attache. Prussian embassy after Bismarck.

At thirty-seven, he was the second secretary of the embassy in Paris and became famous thanks to testimony at the trial of 1874 in the case of his former boss - the ambassador of Germany in France, Count Arnim, rival and opponent of Bismarck. It was said that Holstein, performing Bismarck's tasks, even had to collect dust under the sofa in the waiting room embassies to eavesdrop on von Arnim's conversations. Since

1880, the baron, who remained a bachelor for life, settled in the ministry foreign affairs as an adviser to the political department. It's funny that the author of the biography Bismarck Alan Palmer argued: Bismarck contributed de promotion of "honest and ambitious "baron through the ranks until he became the most de the famous "gray eminence" since the time of Father Joseph, who was under Richelieu.

Palmer himself did not notice how he got into a mess! After all, the "gray cardinals" are distinguished by the fact that they act covertly, in real time, not only are they not famous, but in general little known and have no official weight with absolute *actual* influence. On the career ladder, "gray cardinals" never rise precisely in the strength of his special position.

This is what distinguished the "gray baron" Holstein. He flatly refused all promotions and until leaving business in 1906, formally remained the same modest adviser, in fact running the entire foreign policy of Germany.

Bismarck received his resignation from Wilhelm II in the spring of 1890, and even then the role Holstein in this step was one of the main ones. Why

did Holstein so insistently want to remove Bismarck if he did not aim high myself?

And why Holstein acted in the shadows, behind the scenes, all the most important for diplomatic preparations for world war decades?

The answers are to be found in the main results of Holstein's policy. Already retired Bismarck, he was an ardent opponent of the renewal of the "reinsurance" treaty with Russia. He even hid the text of the treaty from Bismarck's son, Herbert, at the decisive moment. Actually, the "new course" of Chancellor von Caprivi de Caprera di Montecuculi was Holstein course. And this anti-Russian line, which runs counter to the principles of Bismarck, he endured until the end of his career.

But he also disrupted the planned Anglo-German rapprochement. He assured William II, that England, they say, will never go along with France and Russia. After a couple for decades, in the same (for some reason!) way, the English minister provoked the Germans Foreign Affairs Sir Edward Grey, assuring that England would remain neutral. And it's at that the time when England was preparing to declare war on Germany.

Secretary of State, and then Chancellor Bernhard von Bülow was a nominal value, and in reality, everything was decided by the marks of the baron on the margins of diplomatic dispatches. If he wrote: "Cheap!", then the project was set aside.

It was in the hands of Holstein that the most important diplomatic appointments were, he led own correspondence with German representatives abroad. Sometimes he even communicated over the head of the ambassadors with their secretaries and clearly deserved his nickname "great stranger" along with the already beaten "gray reverend" (graue Eminenz) ...

E. V. Tarle, describing in detail the Germany of Wilhelm II, there are many personalities of Holstein did not pay attention, but understood the level of his influence, because he wrote: "All four chancellor who held this post between the resignation of Bismarck and the outbreak of world war, then there is also Caprivi (1890-1894), and Prince Hohenlohe (1894-1900), and Bülow (1900-1909), and Bethmann Helweg (1909-1917), were, in essence, tools and executors of the will of the emperor, more precisely the thoughts of people behind him like Baron Fritz von Holstein"...

But who was behind Holstein?

Tarle - usually very sensitive to the psychological and personal aspects of historical events - for some reason this question was not asked. Moreover, he did not even notice that contradicted himself when he asserted: "Already the presence of such outstanding people as Prince Lichnovsky, Brockdorff-Rantzau, Bernstorff, Kiderlen-Wächter, Marshal von Bieberstein, does not give the slightest right ... to talk about general unsatisfactoriness German diplomacy. Holstein

is not on the list, although all those listed by Evgeny Viktorovich diplomats were junior contemporaries and colleagues of the "gray baron", and in art diplomacy, most likely, they were inferior to him.

True, in one place of his "Europe in the Age of Imperialism" Tarle gave an important characterization of the baron, albeit concise, defective in its brevity. Here it is: "Note that word that in 1890-1907 one person stood behind the back of the emperor, a huge role which only relatively recently (*Tarle wrote this in 1927.* - S. K.) was revealed - Baron Fritz von Holstein, hiding in the shadows ... This man, very hardworking and efficient, in essence, and compiled reports submitted by the chancellors to the emperor, and, in having perfectly studied the nature of Wilhelm, he skillfully prompted the emperor of his resolutions, prompted by the very construction of the report. In 1925 it was documented that Holstein conducted a broad stock market game and was in constant contact with the stock exchange; He reflected the interests of the most aggressive spheres of big capital. He was very important, though hidden spring, through which capitalism created imperialist foreign policy.

However, Tarle immediately added: "This is only a detail, of course. imperialist, an aggressive trend in German foreign policy was inevitable."

It seems that the artistic nature of the liberal Tarle (and he somehow remained bourgeois liberal) did not tolerate German practicality, but was friendly to the Anglo-French way of thinking.

An unbiased view is a limited view. And so Tarle could not understand that even an aggressive trend in German foreign policy was not inevitable, let alone the anti-Russian trend was not at all necessary.

It is useful to compare the opinion of the contemporary of the First World War Tarle with the later the opinion of Professor Guido Giacomo Preparata: "There is no doubt that if Germany left to herself, she would never be the first to start a war: in case of failure, she lost too much. Germany should have been forced into war. This, forcing

Germany to war, among others, was what Holstein was doing. His line was drawn as emphatically anti-Bismarckian, that is, ultimately anti-Russian. But

what was the role of the Kaiser personally here? After all, Wilhelm tried more than once or twice negotiate with Nicholas (and even earlier - with Alexander III). Alas, that was the tragedy, that both in New Berdichev and in Berlin, those supranational forces were actively operating, which were preparing an open, military antagonism between two previously friendly countries. Wilhelm was subtly bypassed and subtly manipulated. The Holstein factor here, if it was a

detail, then a fundamental detail. Tarle involuntarily gave an exact image: Holstein was a *spring*. The spring sets the movement, without it the whole mechanism does not work, but the spring, in turn, is wound up by someone! And no longer a detail, but the essence of the era was that in Germany, even contrary to the intentions of the monarch, someone wound up the spring for the movement of Germany against

Russia. Finishing with Holstein, I'll say that the "crown" (not in meaning, but in time) of the baron's official efforts was the undermining of Germany's positions in Morocco and the conflict over this about France. On this, he exhausted the loans from Wilhelm and was dismissed in three years. until his death.

Nearly seventy-year-old "good-natured" (according to Palmer) turned out to be very vindictive and, through the journalist Garden, rang about homosexual amusements in an intimate circle closest friend of the Kaiser and the second "hidden spring" of supranational anti-Russian circles - Count Philip Eulenburg. An interesting circumstance. Hardly an aged baron collected his "compromising evidence" again *under* the sofas. Rather, he looked for him *on* the sofas in Count Philip's mug. Given the close association of influential Freemasonry with aristocratic homosexuality, then the baron's physiognomy acquires quite a certain connotation - cosmopolitan.

By the way, even at the beginning of his "anti-career" career, von Holstein, on April 26, 1871, was negotiating with the military delegate of the Paris Commune of Klusere about possible recognition of the Communards by the German government, disrupted negotiations in favor of Versailles counter-revolution. In the overall picture of the life of the baron - a trifle. But a trifle significant and revealing. "Grey barons" faithfully serve the Elite, but organically cannot but hate the rebellious "rabble" fighting for their human rights...

Rare and stingy Soviet assessments of Holstein explain his "miscalculations" by dedication to "ossified doctrines and schemes", but hardly a successful exchange the speculator who deftly turns diplomatic secrets into gold was so incapable of break your views. No, it's just that the scheme in which Holstein's policy was inscribed had nothing to do with the interests of Germany from the very beginning, because it isolated Germany, led it to war and created for Germany the image of the future "arsonist war."

Upon closer examination, the "great stranger" turns out to be especially confidant of supranational elite forces. So Graue Eminenz didn't direct

Reich foreign policy. No, it's like *they* were driving, purposefully, for decades, German foreign policy *was corrected* in the right way by the Golden International direction. There were two course goals: a break with Russia and the prevention of an alliance with England.

Bismarck figured out the "under-the-sofa" baron, although late, but figured it out. AND warned the Kaiser against the "man with the eyes of a hyena." Alas, Holstein intrigued and ruled unhindered. Moreover, he ruled until his death, because until the last days was a private adviser to von Bülow and contributed to the last Bosnian the crisis of 1908-09 as on the eve of the imminent Great War.

Then Austria-Hungary annexed the Slavic provinces of Turkey - Bosnia and Herzegovina. Serbia began to protest because it was counting on these Slavic lands as part of the future Yugoslav state. Russia supported Serbia, and Germany, not without the evil will of Holstein, supported the Austrians. The Anglo-French remained on the sidelines, not wanting play along with Russia and thereby strengthen our influence in the Balkans. As a result, authority Russians fell and at the same time disagreements between Russians and Germans received extra drink. Holstein was

certainly an outstanding personality with impeccable knowledge his craft, diplomatic history, court life and secrets. His position was such that, as a rule, not to him, but *he* threatened to resign, and the threat worked every time.

He lived mysteriously, apparently meeting almost no one, avoiding journalists and any public. There is not even a real photograph of him. But history itself showed its true role.

"Holsteins" were in France, and in Russia, and in England, and in America. And everywhere they are one thing was ensured by hands - war. But the German Holstein turned out to be so enigmatic, that its defiant enigmaticity has turned into its opposite.

With the NAME, oddly enough, it is Fritz Holstein that is associated with an almost fleeting, but a very interesting and still misunderstood episode of Russian-German relations. In summer 1905, when there were almost ten years before the start of the First World War, off the island of Björk in Finnish skerries met two emperors - Wilhelm II and Nicholas II.

This date was written about more than once, but its authentic details clearly remained only between two main figures of the Björk rendezvous. On the other hand, about Björk, although wrote repeatedly, but without understanding what happened then and why. So what was the point of Björke? It is hardly

possible to understand this issue, if you do not first look at world politics of the beginning of the 20th century... And it was, although still unsettled completely, still immaturely contradictory in particular, but already a single process in the main, which is hidden, but energetically organized in all countries at the same time supranational World Capital, united in a kind of "Golden International". In

the early years of the 20th century, the arrangement of the pieces of the future Great Game by the Alive The soldiers decided almost completely. A new headquarters was chosen Capital - invulnerable territorially and geopolitically the United States. Yes, for now between America and England there was a relationship of debtor and creditor, and the USA right up to before the First World War were the world's largest debtor, and England - the largest global lender. More precisely, according to the correct remark of Academician V. M. Khvostov, the creditor was an English financial oligarchy, and it could be called English with great a stretch both in terms of formal nationality and in terms of its attitudes - cosmopolitan and egoistic. Further, in all the main

"political" powers, that is, in the USA, England and France, supranational Capital has already taken a confident and decisive position. In Germany, the situation was

somewhat different. At the beginning of the 20th century it was correct opinion that industrial capital is more national than banking. AND

since the commodity-producing economy developed rapidly in Germany, Germany controlled by the Golden International to the least extent. It seems that control over Russia has already been established, but there was no talk of its strength. still early due to the relative backwardness of Russia. For all

that, it was necessary to finally tear Russia away from Germany and make them political union is completely impossible. Capital conceived the coming world upheavals, and Europe was bound to become their arena simply because it had to weaken Germany and Russia. And this was impossible without not only Germany and France was at enmity, but Germany and Russia were divided. Easy to say, but

how to do? After all, outside of Russia, in the Far East, there was such that, on the contrary, Nicholas and the Russians could turn away from "democratic" Europe and bring them closer to "monarchist" Germany. It is about the position of England and France in the conflict between Russia and

Japan ... A little later, this will be discussed in more detail.

Usually, the main political confrontation of those years is considered the Anglo-German, and the contradictions between England and Germany are considered as the main cause of the First world war. And in vain!

Yes, the world of the early twentieth century seemed to be ruled by England, but the world of the twentieth century as a whole were to rule - as conceived by the supranational Elite - the United States. And then the prospective main world contradiction would no longer be Anglo-German, but American-German. In fact, it already existed in the supranational

The elite was taken into account as the most

important. Here is what the German ambassador in Washington, Holleben, wrote on January 1, 1898: "The contradictions between Germany and the United States in economic matters, everything more and more sharpened since the great upsurge experienced by Germany in as an economic force, since we are talking about the mood in the United States, entered into acute stage.

Now Germany is by far the most hated country in the local press and in everyday conversations. This hatred refers primarily to the constraining competitor, but it is also transferred to purely political grounds. We are called bandits and robbers from the main road (*these are Americans who stole a whole continent and tidying up everything that only lies badly!* - S.K.). That the circumstance that the discontent against us goes so far and is more pronounced than against other competitors, is explained here by the fear of our increasing competitiveness in the economic field and in front of our energy and growing political power."

Holleben's assessment is not only bright and accurate. It is also valuable in that it proves that the "debtor" was very much afraid of his "creditor", and England in the USA as a serious the prospect of a competitor was not considered. But there they were very afraid of Germany.

But Germany at the end of the 19th century was only a faint shadow of Germany in the 1900s. XX century!

Holleben's general statements were well illustrated and practically. Spring and In the summer of 1898, the Spanish-American War broke out. Actually the expression "flared up" here is not very true: the fire of American gunboats burned out the remnants of the past influence of Spain in the region, like a steppe fire burns dry grass - uncontrollably and to the ground. States occupied the Caribbean, landed in the Philippines. However, in Manila

Bay to the Philippines was sent from China and the German squadron. June 12, 1898 she anchored in the mind of the American squadron, to help the Germans inferior. The

Yankees are complacent only when they see obedient lackeys in front of them. Germans on this role - at least a hundred years ago - was not suitable, and a wave of

"noble indignation". And, admittedly, the Yankees had something to "resent" from: part tidbits of the "Spanish pie" the Germans from the United States then delayed. Government Spain got away with it, and so sailing away from them, and in Berlin sold Germany the Caroline and the Mariana Islands. Only after the Second World War did America impose on them his raking paw. But that

was only the beginning. Then Lenin, with his constant merciless accurately noted: "The United States has "views" of South America and is fighting the growing influence of Germany in it.

HOWEVER, England also actively fought against German influence. English elite worried about the growth of both general and (especially) naval German power. England was in another conflict with Germany over the Baghdad railway, but it was it is the next and far from the only conflict, far from being at a single point the globe.

But relations between England and Russia, which had never been cordial, were also deteriorating. England openly supported Japan, and in general traditionally "shitted", sometimes covertly, and more often open. On January 30, 1902, an anti-Russian Anglo-Japanese alliance was concluded, relying on which Japan unleashed the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-1905.

In April 1904, a syndicate of English banks, together with an American-Jewish banking house "Kuhn, Loeb and Co" and banker Jacob Schiff provided Japan \$50 million loan. According to the credible (in this case) testimony of Witte, "then the sovereign considered the British our sworn enemies."

True, even in "allied" France, the banker-baron Jacques Ginzburg "in the midst of Manchurian war, - according to the memoirs of Count Ignatiev, - managed to hold a loan for Japan".

Let me turn again to Guido Giacomo Preparat's monograph Hitler, Inc., where an American professor quite rightly notes: "By 1900, it became clear to the British that the Reich could squeeze them out of world politics. Germany can... fall on France and take it out of the game once and for all, after which the eyes of the German Reich will turn to Russia... If Russia and Germany are united in one form or another, then the Eurasian the embrace becomes a reality: that is, in the very center of a huge continent there will arise monolithic Eurasian empire, based on a huge number of Slavic army and German technical genius. The British elite decided by all means not to allow such a development of events, because such a potential state formation would pose a mortal threat to the supremacy of the British Empire...". Something

in the above assessment, of course, needs to be clarified ... So, by 1900, not only the British, but also the Yankees, it became clear that the Reich was a real threat to the plans US world domination, especially if the Reich reinforces itself with an alliance with Russia.

A variant of some "monolithic Eurasian empire" as some kind of direct "state education" with the dominant role of the Germans was really excluded, because Russia would never go for the loss of national and state independence, and no one, including Germany, could force her to do this. Russia is not France, and in purely defensive war in the event of German aggression, the outcome of the war for the German Kaiser would be about the same as a hundred years ago for the French Emperor Napoleon. However, Preparata is right that even a close interstate alliance between Russia and Germany would exclude in the future the world superiority of both British and American empires ... And

against the background of all this, a mutual counter movement of England began towards France and vice versa.

Just seven years ago, between the two colonial superpowers, not only an alliance, but there was simply no trace of normal relations. In the language of the whole world there was a word "Fashoda", and the British and French were on the brink of war - wars are classically

colonial, which would be conducted not under the walls of London and Paris, but thousands of kilometers away from them, but still could arise. Or still couldn't? Here is how it

was. In September 1898, near the village of Fashoda on the White Nile, in the upper great river, two military formations collided head-on. The French colonial detachment of Captain Marchand came here from the French Congo, back in July, hoisted a tricolor flag over the ruins of an old fortress and now stood in the way of the English expedition of General Kitchener, who was going up the Nile.

The general and the captain met not at a secular reception, so the subordination flew to hell: the captain resolutely refused to give in to his senior in rank, and the muddy Nile the waters began to boil from the intensity of passions.

The general commanded a corps of 20 thousand people, the captain - a detachment of a hundred fighters, but the point was not in the local balance of power in a particular African outback. The Fashoda crisis was growing not under the walls of an abandoned fortress in Eastern Sudan, but in European capitals. It was a serious test of the emerging

global colonial "layout", but a political test, when the ink of newspaper hacks flowed like a stream, and not the blood of soldiers, and in combat was introduced not by advanced units, but by advanced articles. During the Fashoda conflict connections were groped, the chances of future coalitions were assessed. In other words, "claps" for now they didn't fight and the forelocks were cracking at the "pans" for the time being.

France suddenly found itself in such discord with England that, as academician Tarle wrote, even in the ultranationalist French press, for the first time in many, many years, to ask the question: who should rather be considered the eternal, hereditary enemy of France – Germany or England? The

question was, it must be said, not an idle one: in the end, Joan of Arc freed Homeland not from the "Teutons", but from the British.

It got to the point that projects began to be drawn up to involve Germany in the war with England is on the side of France and ... Russia. But Germany at that moment could get more from an amicable agreement with England on a colonial field, and France had to give in.

The general crushed the captain's corns, even though Marchand went to Fashoda through jungles and swamps of Central Africa for two whole years. Actually,

a military skirmish between France and England could only strengthen Germany, and this was by no means included in the calculations of the planners of a future world war, so that England and France, instead of mutual scuffle, had to switch to mutual, although questionable consent. In March 1899, France received in compensation the area around Lake Chad...

It's funny, but even Marxist historians called one of the factors of the planned "friendship" of the former "Fashod" enemies personal de diplomacy of the English king Edward VII. He, they say, was a supporter of the Anglo-French and Anglo-Russian (ha!) rapprochement, but he was hostile to both Wilhelm and Germany. Historians have not forgotten about

Edward, but the fact that on both sides of the English Channel politics determined by the Rothschilds of London and Paris, for some reason overlooked. However the main thing was just this: the union of bankers was in dire need of an Anglo-French alliance.

France, although bragging, was decrepit. The French economy was losing dynamism, France - a worthy prospect. But, let me remind you, without France, how the only *really* anti-German continental great power, could not the next Great War will begin.

Therefore, France had to be securely taken over by controlled union. The English king was here only a crowned chairman like Pound in Ilfo-Petrovsky "Golden Calf" and nothing more.

In addition, Edward did not have to work especially hard: France willingly went to backtracking on past disputes, and on April 8, 1904, an Anglo-French agreement was signed an agreement that formally dealt with the division of spheres of influence in Africa (and in some trifles), but in fact it was a mortgage board in the future building of the anti-German global union. The agreement was called in the press "cordial agreement", in French "Entente cordiale".

This is where the Entente came from. Russia this "consent" went sideways. Increasingly tied to France by loans and policy of financial St. Petersburg - New Berdichev, Russia looked gloomily at the prospect of being tied to England as well. Russia

was defeated in the war with Japan, France did not help her, but was inactive, and even helped Japan with the hands of Jacques Ginzburg. England was hostile open.

Friends are tested in trouble, and even in such a local trouble as the Far East "Japanese" embarrassment, the behavior of Europe willy-nilly forced to think even lazy at the thought of the Russian monarch "Nika": is it worth linking your fate with the "Europes" or still not breaking with the "old friend" Germany ...

Moreover, Kaiser Wilhelm of Tsar Nicholas persistently pushed for this.

SO, supranational Capital, on the one hand, had to nip in the bud the possibility of German-Russian agreement, and on the other hand, to finally fasten Russia to their own "consent". And

the method for this, apparently, was chosen as skillfully as risky. Although, however, with an accurate account of the psychology of Wilhelm and Nicholas, as well as in view of the fact that the external evil influence on Russian politics was powerful and deep, the risk was not very great and was even completely excluded.

Perhaps the chosen method can be described as "counter-mine". What is he doing smart and skillful soldier, if the enemy leads an underground mine under him? Yes, of course begins to lead his countermine in order to pre-emptively detonate someone else's mine and completely upset the enemy calculations. Such a countermine of the financial West became for hopes of Wilhelm II German (however, German, perhaps, only superficially) plan new European political landscape.

No one left documents about this story, and could not leave it: such plans do not trust paper. But here's what logic tells us...

Germany needed an alliance with Russia, and that would inevitably be an alliance against France as a continental enemy of the Reich and against England as its own global enemy.

But Russia also objectively needed an alliance with Germany. Gaining stability in western border, it could make the best use of all the benefits of mutual trade with the Germans. A lot, considering that for Russia the only reasonable foreign policy was one that would ensure peace and accelerated development internal wealth. Did the notorious "colonial question" matter to Russia if it had its own territory neglected?! However, Russia was bound by agreements

with France and it was not so easy to break them. could, received and still unpaid loans held tsarism firmly here. William he understood this, but he relied too much not only on himself, on the common sense of Nicholas II, but also on their advisors.

At the end of October 1904, the Kaiser wrote to Nikolai about "a combination of the three most strong continental powers. Naturally, Germany, Russia and France, but the Kaiser mentioned France, as they say, for the sake of formality. He hardly doubted that if Nicholas could be moved to a common alliance, this would lead to rupture of Russia with the newly built "cordial agreement".

It is hardly worth condemning Wilhelm for such an attitude. He thought stupidly positions of protection of German and Russian interests. And the approach here was simple: not France will join - the trouble is not great. And even if she joins, then the grief is also small: she will still have to play second fiddle in Europe. Actually, to be honest, the French

could not count on anything else, the only question was who was in one of the two possible triple ensembles with the participation

the French and Russians will be "prima" - England or Germany?

An alliance with Albion meant for France a war with the Germans, an alliance with Germany and Russia - also a war, but obviously more acceptable - outside Europe, on the colonial fronts.

So there was a sense in Wilhelm's undertaking ... And she looked especially reasonable in her striving for a lasting peace with Russia. One Kaiser did not take into account branching international, in modern terms, a network of "agents of influence" and consistency their actions, including in his own Vaterland. That is why in Russian affairs he willingly began to act according to the plan ... Holstein and with the participation of Holstein.

Yes, yes, reader, the staunch Russophobe Baron Fritz von Holstein suddenly got inspired thought of the common destinies of the two monarchies and began to prepare a meeting between the Kaiser and the Tsar ...

As a result, the idea arose of their meeting in the Bjork skerries, but such a detail as the chores Holstein, immediately allows us to assume in the idea of the future Björk meeting bottom, arranged by Holstein, or rather, arranged by others through the "gray baron."

There are no miracles in the world of finance-driven politics, so love for Russian Baron Fritz flared up clearly for a reason. "Timeo danaos et dona ferentes," used to say in "Aeneide" Virgil, and the advice of the ancient Roman poet to be afraid of the Danaans, even bringing gifts, was quite appropriate for the case of the German Holstein. Events

unfolded like this... On October 27, 1904, the Russian ambassador in Berlin, Osten Saken, reported to Foreign Minister Lamzdorf: "I was very surprised when two days ago I was informed by a party that Baron Holstein, the first counselor of the ministry foreign affairs, wants to see me. You will, of course, remember, dear Count, that this important person, may be the true inspirer of the policy of the Berlin Cabinet, for official ambassadors remained invisible.

Having met with the Russian-Ostsee baron, the Berlin baron made the same speeches as the Kaiser in his letter to the tsar: they say, it is worth thinking about how to create an alliance of Germany and Russia, drawing the French into it, who are afraid of the prospects of staying on the continent alone.

Describing the Björk episode, Academician Tarle later stated: "What France gets scared and joins, Holstein, and after him the Chancellor Prince Bülow and especially Wilhelm no doubt."

Well, the Chancellor and the Kaiser might have thought so, although it is unlikely, because it is too it was obvious that even if France would be "scared", then "join" her with Germany new "cordial friends" from across the Strait (and secretly also from across the ocean) will not allow it in any way. However, the monarch and the prince could have had certain hopes, since, as already it was said that there was a certain reason for France in the ideas of the Kaiser.

But what you should not build illusions about is what is naive (according to Tarle's estimate) thought Baron Holstein. Tarle describes Wilhelm as a kind limited, narrow-minded, obscure. Well, even so (although it is unlikely that So). But Holstein absolutely does not fall under such a characteristic. He was like once cold-bloodedly prudent and knew the European situation thoroughly. Why, then,

did Holstein act the way he did? Reasonable explanation one thing arises: the calculation was that Wilhelm would be carried away by the thrown Holstein with an idea that was already roaming around in his head. Then it was necessary organize a meeting between the Kaiser and the Tsar in the most informal setting and slip "Nicky" through "Willy" such an agreement, which, at first glance, is firmly

would unite Germany and Russia, but in fact would contradict the obligations of Russia towards France. The political

and diplomatic mediocrity of the Russian Tsar and his indifference to serious daily state work for behind-the-scenes directors is not a secret were. Therefore, one could firmly count on the fact that Nikolai, as thoughtlessly, would sign Russian-German treaty, so thoughtlessly it will be abandoned after its dissuaded by the stunned Russian ministers, or the Russian "agents" who were informed in advance influence, or both at the same time. Indeed, in New Berdichev it was often difficult find out who is the dignitary here, and who is the agent. One personality Witte reasons for reflection gave enough.

The reaction of the Kaiser to the "treacherous" refusal of the king was not difficult to predict. The "counter mine" exploded and tore to shreds not only the sham "contract", but also the possibility of no longer a false, but a genuine, without the mediation of the Holsteins and "Witt", the union of Russia and Germany.

For Holstein, the arrangement of such political "counter mines" was a matter of habitual. So, in the memoirs of Herbert von Dirksen, who was the German ambassador to the USSR, and to Japan, and to England, we read: "I never believed in the possibility of a Russo-Japanese war unleashed on the initiative of Japan (*more precisely, unleashed by Japan on the initiative England.* - S.K.). Moreover, I have always favored Joseph Chamberlain's plan to bring about an understanding between Britain, Germany and Japan. To the plan that was thwarted by the psychopathic (*well, well.* - S.K.) leader of the German foreign policy by Holstein...". Here, too,

everything went like clockwork ... In the spring of 1905, Chancellor Bülow (obviously after conversations with Holstein) advised Wilhelm to invite Nikolai to meet in time for another walk of the Kaiser in the Baltic. The place and time of the meeting were chosen skillfully: the situation is unbusinesslike; Russian ministers who are obliged under the laws of the Russian empires to countersign (certify) the royal signature, will be far away, except incompetent naval minister Birilev (the one who is in the Pacific Ocean "replaced" French spark plugs with state-owned stearin ones).

No prior opposition from political advisers the king was out of the question, because even Wilhelm acted in secret from his own retinues.

On July 10 (according to the new style - 23) July 1905, Nikolai went to meet Wilhelm. Here is how these two days are described in the diary of the king:

"July 10th. Sunday We

got up at 9 o'clock with hot weather with dark clouds. <...> Exactly at one o'clock went to "Polar Star" in Bjork, where he arrived at 4 o'clock. Anchored at the stop. Ravitsa. There were two thunderstorms with heavy rain, but the temperature is pleasant. From 7 o'clock. were waiting for the arrival "Hohenzollern" (Kaiser's *yacht.* - S.K.), cat. late by two and a half hours. He came up to time for our late lunch. Wilhelm came to the yacht in excellent spirits and stayed for a while. Then he took Misha and me to his place and fed me a late dinner. We returned to the "Polyarnaya" only at 2 o'clock on *July 11th.*

Monday Slept the flag

up and got up at 9¼. The weather was sunny, hot, with a fresh SO (*south-east.* - S.K.). At 10 o'clock Wilhelm arrived for coffee. We talked until 12 noon and the three of us Misha went to Germany. cruise. "Berlin". Looked it over. Showed art. teaching.

I brought Wilhelm to him and returned to the "Polyarnaya". It was half an hour of rest. At 2 o'clock at us had a great breakfast. Listened to the music of Gvar. Ek. (*Guards Crew.* - S.K.) and We talked all the time standing up to 4½. I said goodbye to Wilhelm with great cordiality. Picked up at 5 o'clock. at the same time and to the lighthouse, the Vercomotals walked together; then parted ways. <...> Returned home under the best impressions spent with Wilhelm

hours".

Let's calculate ...

On July 10, the monarchs met at about ten in the evening and were together for less than four hours, and spent time in such a way that the next morning "Niki" woke up not without difficulty. Then joint time for everything about everything is about six hours, including coffee, travel, teaching, singing and parting. The Björk Treaty was signed, as they say, between two cups of coffee.

On the Russian side, he was countersigned by the sixty-year-old Admiral Birilev. But how! The king invited him to the cabin and offered to put his signature under the text, which before covered it with his

hand. However, maybe he didn't cover up anything, but Birilev simply added later to his justification, and then this detail went for a walk from monograph to monograph.

But, one way or another, from the Minister of Foreign Affairs Lamzdorf and from Witte hide behind it didn't work out with a palm, and they reared up: the treaty is unacceptable and destroys the entire system of external relations of the empire.

The extent to which this system meets Russian interests was not discussed. True, Witte, returning from America after peace negotiations with Japan, was received by the Kaiser and, as we will see, "with sympathy" reacted to the ideas of the crowned interlocutor about the desirability an alliance of three continental powers.

Why, if you carefully read the Treaty of Björk, you can see that it is by no means programmed the war. Rather, on the contrary, he insured Europe from a European war.

Article one read: "In the event that one of the two empires is attacked from one of the European powers, her ally will come to her aid in Europe with all with its land and sea forces.

What did it mean?

If Germany attacked France, Russia could be on the sidelines, but if France attacked Germany, Russia was obliged to come to Germany's aid. So what? Of course, Russia was bound by an agreement with France, but this agreement did not contain recorded (though implied) Russian commitment to support France's aggression against Germany. That is, the spirit and letter of Björke rather programmed the European world, which was, in fact, a circumstance only commendable. Further,

Article Three determined that the treaty came into force "immediately after the conclusion peace between Russia and Japan", and the fourth article provided that "the Emperor All-Russian, after the entry into force of this treaty, will take the necessary steps to to acquaint France with this treaty and to induce her to accede to it in as an ally."

As you can see, the agreement was concluded, in fact, not behind France's back.

"It is BORING to live in this world, gentlemen!" Gogol complained. Seems like a lot of water flowed away in the Finnish skerries past the island of Björk, rested - in peace and not very much - everyone involved in the Björk venture. And on May 12, 1951, the 6th volume was signed for publication. second edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia. And there, on page 441, in black on white was printed: "Article 4 obliged Russia not to inform France about the treaty until its entry into force, and only after the entry into force of the treaty, Russia had the right (! - S.K.) to provide France with relevant information in order to encourage her join as an ally."

I don't know why, but the encyclopedic edition maliciously misrepresented this old and a history that seems to have been archived for a long time. After all, Article 4 did not "oblige Russia not to communicate" anything to the French before the entry into force of the treaty, but only determined the period after which Russia not only "had the right" to inform France, but was obliged to notify.

The difference is still significant...

Nevertheless, Lamsdorf, and later Witte, were, according to Tarle, horrified by the treaty. I do not think, reader, that Lamsdorf should be suspected of a double game. In a letter to the ambassador Paris Nelidov, he bitterly complained at the same time about Bjork's "trouble" and about "strange adventures of the last two years." The old diplomat believed that Russia would be better off not communicate with anyone at all. It would be true, but in reality you had to choose between two options. To

do without close ties with one of the major European powers of Russia was there is no way: we are too far behind in economic and technological development, and to get out of this gloomy reality into a more cheerful one had to be with the help of more a developed and at least minimally loyal partner to Russia.

England fell out of favor here. And compared to France, Germany was undoubtedly the best choice. Lamsdorf poorly (more precisely - in no way) was not oriented in problems technological progress and so on. Therefore, he was poorly aware of the inevitability of choice. ally. However, one cannot suspect Lamsdorf of behind-the-scenes anti-Russian machinations. And what about

Witte? Until September 5, 1905, he was in America negotiating with the Japanese. After returned to Europe, where he met several times in Paris with the financier Neitslin and with one entertaining financier - sixty-three-year-old Maurice Rouvier. Deceased at In 1911, Rouvier was not just a banker, but also a politician: Minister of Finance in 1889-1892 and in 1902-1905, prime minister in 1887 and 1905-1906. A break in his political activity at the end of the 19th century was forced: Rouvier was involved in fraud Panamanian company for the construction of a canal between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans (the famous "Panama"). However, at the beginning of the 20th century, in the era of preparation, much more large-scale fraud, *someone* again needed Ruvier and was withdrawn from the reserve in current politicians (more precisely, politicians).

Witte's trustworthy Parisian "cupids" with Rouvier do not trust Sergei Yulievich they add, especially if we take into account the fact that in America he talked not only with Japanese in the American Portsmouth and not only with activists of the Women's Protection Society monuments of antiquity ...

Something, but there were, perhaps, more influential international swindlers in the New World than in the Old! And everything we know (or everything we *don't know*) about Witte's stay in America gives reason to think that the future Count did not avoid suspicious contacts. It can be assumed that the dates of the Bjorksky the dates were behind the scenes coordinated with the timing of Witte's return to Europe, and only slightly spaced apart in time for camouflage.

There are grounds for such an assumption ... Here is the sequence events. The Treaty of Björk has been signed, and its third article directly links the beginning the entry into force of the treaty with peace with Japan, that is, in fact, with the return of Witte.

Before this return, a decent pause was maintained, during which both Nikolai and Wilhelm are confident that everything will be more or less in order. Lamsdorf is not an influential figure, and Witte once spoke in favor of a continental union (although deeds, not words, undermined its basis - German-Russian relations).

Finally, Witte comes ashore from an ocean-going steamer. Want to see him and English King Edward VII, and the Kaiser. However, Nikolai beats Witte in Paris with a dispatch with direct command to call on the way home to the Emperor Wilhelm.

September 10 Witte - five minutes to Count Sakhalin (the wits remade this title in "Polu-Sakhalin", because Russia lost half of Sakhalin) - already in Berlin and meets with Chancellor Bülow. The tone of the conversation is such that Bülow is confident in the success of Björksky contracts.

Then Witte is a guest in the hunting castle of the Kaiser "Gross Rominten". Impression Wilhelm in a telegram to Bulow: "The meeting exceeded all expectations. Witte was extremely frank and sincere."

In Rominten, Witte first got acquainted with the text of the Treaty of Björk, immediately shed a tear and "because of excitement and admiration he could not utter a word." Then still exclaimed: "Praise the Lord! Thank the Lord! Finally we got rid of disgusting nightmare that surrounded us "...

These words have come down to us, however, in the version of the Kaiser, so this royal The "reporter" could add some emotions and add. However, the fact that Witte met Björke with a bang is better than the Kaiser's notes are proved by the facts: Witte left Rominten completely treated kindly. He took away the highest German Order of the Red Eagle (the Kaiser granted the Order of the Black Eagle him in 1897) and a portrait of the owner of the castle with his own autograph: "Portsmouth - Björke - Rominten". A serious

business: Wilhelm personally escorted his cousin's subject to the station! The Kaiser in Rominten was sure that Witte was his like-minded person, and enthusiastically discussed with him the international tasks of Russia and Germany. Witte agreed. Why not and not roll him in Germany *vanka* ? The main thing was waiting for Sergei Yulievich in Petersburg.

He appears there, having spoken with Ruvier (and not with him alone) in earnest and with the Kaiser - acting. And then everything turns differently: from an enthusiast of the Björk agreements Witte becomes their destroyer. But then

again, how it was all arranged! In the presentation of Witte himself "convinced" Lamzdorf. Well, maybe he convinced him sincerely. But here Witte "resisted" him, clearly hypocritical, in order to create the impression of "changing his position" under the "weight" of objective reality and the "obligations assumed by Russia" earlier. Witte acted out an uncomplicated (for the methodical Lamzdorf, nothing else was required) farce and, at a meeting with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, pretended to be unfamiliar with the conditions agreements in Björk. Here we do not need to speculate, the scene was described by Witte himself. Lamzdorf handed Witte the text:

- Read what a "charm"! Witte took a paper that he knew very well, paused, and "exploded" into "noble indignation": - How! Yes,

this is a direct catch, not to mention the non-equivalence of the contract. After all, he dishonorable to France, for that alone makes him impossible! Is the sovereign our treaty with France is unknown? How

unknown! Well known. The sovereign, perhaps, forgot him, but more likely I didn't understand the essence of the matter in the fog cast by Wilhelm," answered Lamzdorf.

Witte again began to talk about the dishonesty of the Björk alliance. Judging by this reactions, communication with Maurice Rouvier had a profoundly ennobling effect on Witte, and he could not, after meeting such a "crystal" personality, think differently than a person honor.

Discarding the irony, I will inform you that the "convinced" Witte, who "suddenly" saw the whole the "ugliness" of those ideas over which he shed tears of happiness a few days ago in Rominten, began ardently arguing the need for the immediate annihilation of the treaty with Germany. And then he also fastened the tsar's uncle, Grand Duke Nicholas, to the case. Nikolaevich, who had an influence on Nicholas II, but did not have any serious political outlook. The first act

of Witte's farce (Witte's in performance, but of course not in plan) - Romintain - was behind. Now it was necessary to bring to the end the second act - New Berdichevsky.

Here it was - together with Lamzdorf, who was afraid of both an alliance with France and an alliance with Germany, and was afraid to disobey, and with Nikolai Nikolaevich, who was not afraid of anything, but didn't understand anything, but he was easily controlled from the outside - Witte convinced the emperor that The Björk Treaty must be abolished.

Yes, not without reason, to know, Nikolai the day after parting with Wilhelm On July 12 (25) he made an entry in his diary: "In the morning, life went back to its usual track. Joyfully was to see children, but not ministers.

Heart felt. But

why did the sober, extremely cynical and prudent Witte speak in Rominten one thing, and in St. Petersburg another, exactly the opposite? And why portrayed before Lamzdorf "ignorance"?

Regarding the last "why", the answer is obvious. If Witte confessed to the head Russian diplomacy, who is familiar with the text of the Björk Treaty, Lamzdorf immediately would ask the inevitable and natural question: "Well, how do you, Sergey Yulievich, find this contract? What did you say about him to Emperor Wilhelm? And then Witte would have to lie bigger and riskier. But why did

he lie at all? Let's say he didn't have the guts in Romintain to disappoint a hospitable and generous host. But why was clowning around in front of

Lamzdorf? Yes, and

before Nikolai ... Some biographers of Witte explain everything by his desire to be pleasing crowned, but a high dignitary who cares about his personal position more than about profit powers, otherwise it is difficult to call them scoundrels.

And everything will become with

the scoundrel. No, the strange double metamorphosis of Holstein and Witte (one of the Russophobe suddenly became "Russophile", and the other from the propagandist of the idea of an alliance of three continental powers turned into a destroyer of practical steps towards such an alliance) is deprived of any mystery, if we proceed from the fact that both here and there there was a performance painted for two roles, and both roles were anti-Russian and anti-German. Witte

was especially disgusting and provocative in this performance. Disavowing Treaty of Björk, he wrote to Berlin at the same time that the Tsar de not only remained faithful decision, but now even more convinced of the need to achieve target in Björk. Witte also lied about the fact that Lamzdorf allegedly also supports concluded union. Like, it only takes time to prepare the ground for change in French position. Illusions were maintained so that their collapse was as more painful and irreparable. The Kaiser

rejoiced at the success, and Nikolai was forced to write to his Berlin cousin that the treaty, they say, should be supplemented with a declaration of its inapplicability in the event of a war between Germany and France, since Russia has obligations to France. The German Emperor, in a telegram dated September 29, 1905, reasonably replied to the Tsar that "Russia's obligations towards France can only matter insofar as she (France) by her behavior deserves to fulfill them."

This did not help either - Nikolai from the agreements certified in writing by him in Björk refused.

Wilhelm, when he was informed about Russia's refusal to sign the "autocrat All-Russian", was shocked. Kaiser, however, even after that tried to dissuade Nikolai from tack from the Bjork course, wrote to him: "What is signed is signed," but the king was organically incapable of decisive and original action. He relented.

Formally, he

lost to Witte, in fact - to the screenwriters and directors of the future war. Although only in 1907, in response to the attempts of the Germans to recognize the treaty, "tacitly existing", Petersburg finally answered that the treaty was not only being considered as non-existent, but in no way can be renewed.

In the same 1907, Russia was attached to the Anglo-French "cordial" Entente.

ACADEMICIAN Tarle wrote a separate book about Witt, as always interesting, but hardly profound. In Bjork, Tarle saw only the awkward, fantasy intrigue of Wilhelm's adventure, and, finishing the story about the end of the Bjork episode, Eugene Viktorovich stated with amusing pathos: "Wilhelm was again convinced, as in 1892–1894 that he could not cope with Witte. Not to Emperor Wilhelm with Eulenburg and Bulow was also to take on this intricate task - to deceive Count Witte when it the friendly and collective mental work of the most experienced banking syndicates and concerns, the most battle-hardened, the most powerful world exchanges.

Funny (or sad?) here is not only what is usually completely ironic Tarla the sense of proportion failed and he portrayed the dubious personality of the "Portsmouth half-Sakhalin" count in the form of a sort of super-financier, super-stoic and super-titan, single-handedly beating the entire World Exchange. Even more

amusing (or is it still sad?) that Tarle was not mistaken, although not that said. Indeed, the World Exchange never managed to "deceive Count Witte" on that the simple reason that she always ruled it!

One of those who was involved in this - the director of the Paris-Netherlands bank to Neitslin, there was little concern about Witte's reputation. And so he didn't need to smooth the "image" of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Empire and hide from his amusing verbal passages, about which - a little lower. Witte returned to Russia, already engulfed in revolution. Manchurian suffering and The Tsushima tragedy of Russian peasants in the name of dividends from Parisian rentiers has ended. Now, for the first time, people's Russia demanded that tsarism pay interest on blood and sweat spilled near Mukden, in the Tsushima Strait and near Port Arthur.

The bourgeois-landowner empire could no longer delay this legal payment without "Danaan gifts" of European bankers, and to determine the terms of a new loan in Petersburg brought together representatives of the banking groups of France, Germany, England, America and Holland. As you can see, *this* "International" knew how to unite - despite official interstate tensions - and without the appeals of Marx and Engels.

On October 16, 1905, that is, a little over a month after their last meeting, Witte saw the head of the French delegation, Neitslin. Neytslin then recalled that Witte repeated *three times, emphasizing each word* : "Tell Ruvier firmly and strongly that nothing will happen in the relations between France, Russia and Germany without the knowledge or behind the back of the French government." And then he added: "There is more things I can't tell you, but tell Ruvier firmly that he can rely on the words that I instruct you to convey. Usually, it is

not prime ministers of a great power who behave this way, but people who are dependent, dependent. In other words, people who are very reminiscent of agents of certain forces. Well, in fact, why would Witte what he conveyed to Rouvier through the "spoiled telephone" through Neitslin, not to be transmitted through him in a sealed letter?

But no, it turns out that there was a lot of things between Witte and Rouvier (and not between Russia and France!) such that paper is not trusted in any way! And it was all, of

course, for good reason. Witte was deceitful, hypocritical and prone to acting already by virtue of the circumstances of his career from its earliest stages. And from its earliest stages, he was associated with banking capital of Russia. And this automatically meant that he was also connected with a foreign banking capital, as the patron of "Russian" capital (more precisely, New Berdichev capital). This has already been discussed. So as Witte's influence grew, so did his influence on Russia. this external capital. It was, perhaps, true and the opposite: strengthened in Russia foreign capital - Witte also strengthened. For what purpose was this done?

The answer can be found, perhaps, in a letter from the Minister of Finance, Count V. N. Kokovtsov Nicholas II of January 19, 1914: "Count Witte brings more and more, not proposals that arose in the State Duma, clearly designed for one thing - to destroy what stands still firmly is our finances. The political

biography of Count Witte can be matched with one key word: loans. And the true synonym for the concept of foreign loans for Russia was also the only one: the web. So Sergei Yulievich did not deserve the praises of Tarle in the least. His role was always sharply negative and anti-national. Of course, he is an exception

was not here, almost all the dignitaries of tsarism associated with finances played a similar role Russian Empire and figured in the political arena from the second half of the 19th century until the collapse of old Russia in 1917. But Witte was exceptional in the sense that he had an outstanding influence on the process of such a financial enslavement of Rus', with in which the original foreign loans first gave impetus to the Russian economy, and then they sucked it out according to the classical blood-sucking

scheme. In addition, loans went largely to cover military preparations, that is, here too ensured the interests of not Russia, but France, and then the Entente and the United States.

Finally, loans helped to fight the revolution, that is, the legal demands peoples of Russia.

The topic of Russian loans in Soviet (and even more so in Western) historiography is not deeply was considered, and we are not going to delve into it right now. But directly to The Björk episode is adjoined - both in time and in meaning - by Witte's troubles regarding that loan of 1906, which had one underlying reason. The one about which Witte spoke to Neitslin bluntly like this: "The French and the government must first understand that they are all will lose here if we have a real revolution." I note in brackets

that this valuable confession of Witte completely refutes the tales of that the first Russian revolution was led de anti-Russian "Jewish" financial circles. On the contrary, these circles, which decided everything in Europe, the revolution financially helped suppress.

Witte himself writes in his memoirs about his stay in Paris after return from Portsmouth to Europe in early September 1905, the following: "I was accompanied by Mr. Neitzlin, director of Paris et Pays Bas, who was the representative syndicate of the French group to make a Russian loan without being included in this a syndicate of Jewish banking houses that shied away from participating in Russian loans from the time of the Kishinev pogrom of the Jews organized by Plehve, despite my personal relations with the head of the house of Rothschild, who was always the head of the syndicate for making Russian loans when Jewish firms took part in it.

Considering only the fact that, for example, Jacques Gunzburg actively participated in the implementation of the Russian loan of 1906, one can laugh at these statements of Witte openly and for a long time. B after all, Neitzlin himself headed a far from anti-Semitic banking group. into her included: the Lyon Credit (!), the Paris-Netherlands Bank, the National Office, the General Society, the Gottinger banking house, and other smaller banks. IN most of the banks of this so-called "Russian group" the influence of Jewish capital was either predominant or at least significant. In other words, tell both

Witte himself and his biographers that Witte de several times, including through Artur Rafalovich, "unsuccessfully" probed the mood London and Parisian Rothschilds, give us reason to smile once again.

Of course, the Rothschilds "left" the business of Russian loans only in order to stay. To remain where directly, and where indirectly, through subsidiary or related banks, through participation in the profits of the Nobels and their other international robbery partners Russia.

Duplicity Witte did not leave him at the very end of his life. In the spring of 1914, in March, Novoye Vremya published a series of conversations with an "anonymous" Russian statesman, in which any St. Petersburg clerk who was not alien to "political arguments" easily recognized our count. And there Witte declared that he always considered that the main lever of Russian foreign policy is the closest possible connection with Germany. Nothing more and nothing less!

The matter of a future war had already been established by that time, a wedge between Russia and He was thoroughly driven in by Germany, and now Witte could once again get into the "Germanophiles" without the risk of interfering with the black cause of a future war. Possibly pursued by Witte (and his ammo) and another target. In the spring of 1914, negotiations were planned between Russia and Germany on new trade treaty, and Witte firmly believed that this mission would be entrusted on him. One can only guess how the best friend of the French bankers Sergei Yulyevich would try to "strengthen" Russian-German trade relations. Thank God, it didn't

work out ... It is significant

that when the war began, Witte in the autumn of 1914 was very busy about publication in the Historical Bulletin of his report of 1894 on the structure of the military port on Murman. In

the Baltic to London - 1300 kilometers, and from Murman, around Scandinavia - 3000 kilometers. It is clear that with the paucity of the then economic development of the Russian In the north, Russia needed the port of Murmansk only in case of war with Germany. And the king then reasonably chose the option of a naval base in Libau, although Witte lobbied for the option Murmansk. In

the autumn of the first war year, Witte no longer had any reason to pretend, and the former allegedly a "Germanophile" of the spring of that year was in a hurry to prove that he supposedly foresaw "Teutonic machinations" twenty years before their heyday...

Only in this, in shameless chameleonism, Witte remained unchanged and true to himself. until the end of life that followed in 1915. Björke turned out

to be an unsuccessful episode because it was conceived by his true by the creators as a doomed episode. Wilhelm wanted to see in Björk a turn towards new order of things, when leadership in Europe would pass from England to Germany, Nikolai, although not strong in political mind and action, but sometimes able to understand, I saw in Björk an opportunity for stability for Russia.

But the forces that gave rise to figures like Holstein and Witte, from the very beginning were plotting a quick explosion of the Björk Accords, after the spent wick was set on fire and burned to the end. The end of

Björke's ideas became at the same time a logical point in attempts to change moving from a future European war to a possible European peace.

Of course, Wilhelm should by no means be regarded only as a victim of the intrigues of Holstein and genuine cartridges of the latter. Kaiser's impulsiveness, superficiality and self-confidence - these features were inherent in him, alas, in fatal proportions.

If he had not seized on the sly idea of some almost impromptu treaty in skerries to the fanfare of the Guards crew and champagne of "late dinners", but developed vein of the German-Russian alliance thoughtfully, in a series of convincing conversations not behind Lamsdorf, not behind the backs of the social forces of Russia and Germany, but against the background of a common and good prepared change in German public sentiment in favor of only and exclusively to Russia, if all this was supported by an even more active credit German policy in Russia, then everything could go against the plans of the Holsteins, and more precisely, with the plans of those who directed the Holsteins and Witte.

However, we will not remove the blame from the honest in relation to their homeland German diplomats, German politicians, as well as from the whole of German society. And they are not showed far-sightedness and proved incapable of broad opposition behind-the-scenes intrigues of behind-the-scenes supranational forces.

The same, of course, must be said about honest in relation to their homeland Russian diplomats, politicians, public figures... Almost all of them are also not fulfilled their duty to Russia. Only protested against a future war the Bolsheviks led by Lenin, and even Leo Tolstoy ... Tolstoy

wrote prophetically in the article "Christianity and Patriotism" immediately after the visit French squadron to St. Petersburg in October 1893: "We all know that no we have not experienced any special love for the French before, nor do we feel now, in the same way as the fact that we have not experienced and do not experience any hostility to Germans ... No matter how peaceful Alexander III was, there will be such circumstances that he it will not be possible to renounce the war, which will be demanded by all those around him, all the newspapers, and, as it always seems, the public opinion of the whole people. Ring the bells, get dressed long-haired people (*that is, priests in golden robes*. - S. K.) into golden bags and begin pray for the kill. And the old, long-known, terrible thing will begin again ...

Tolstoy's article was published in translation in France, in England, in Germany, and in In Russia, it was distributed only in underground hectographed publications ... Alas, the prophecy of Lev Nikolayevich came true point to point, although not in the reign of a mediocre Alexander III, and in the reign of his mediocre son Nicholas ...

COMBINING the Rothschild factor with the Holstein method gave excellent - for Capital, of course - the results even before the war. Academician Tarle believed without a shadow of a doubt that the British de cabinet "for the sake of economy" sincerely proposed to Germany to limit naval weapons. However, what "savings" and "restrictions" are there! In 1907, during 2nd Hague Conference on War and Peace, the British Admiralty wrote: "The production of warships is closely connected in all branches of production and trade and therefore attracts legitimate attention and interests. And a big blow in these interests is any proposal to limit the growth of naval armaments. Such a restriction would seriously affect one of the main industries of the national industry." The

Germans, however, said the same thing: "Suspension for a year of the construction of the fleet throw a lot of people out into the street." Admiral Tirpitz warned the Reichstag that the delay with funding will lead to the fact that "we will be forced to lay off a large number of people, and the whole branch of our shipbuilding will be upset. His English colleagues confirmed: "England has the highest interest in the development shipbuilding, in trade for the sake of life and prosperity.

Twelve-inch shells weighing half a ton were, of course, very peculiar "Pledge of Peaceful Trade". And the new series of peaceful dry cargo ships as a means to support For some reason, the Lords of the Admiralty did not come to mind with the economy. Already in the eighties years of the 20th century, their compatriot is a professor of international history at the London James Joll University - describing the origins of the First World War, he believed that the race, they say, of naval arms launched economic processes that "it was difficult stop". The professor clearly put the cart before the horse. On the contrary: economic the processes of imperialism set off an arms race. The arms

race led to war exactly as Engels prophesied. As we know, in 1904 an agreement was concluded between England and France. In 1907, Russia joined it and the Tripartite Accord was formed (on paper, however, then not fixed).

Until the summer of 1914, there were seven years left, and they passed in polishing the situation on "abrasive" of a number of conflicts and provocations of various

kinds. So, on August 31, 1907, Russian-English conventions were signed on Persia, Afghanistan and (don't smile, reader) Tibet. Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian empire, Izvolsky and the English ambassador, Sir Arthur Nicholson, exchanged identical notes.

Alexander Petrovich Izvolsky replaced Lamzdorf, and before that he was envoy in Copenhagen. Ever since the conflicts between Denmark and Germany around Schleswig and Holstein (not a baron, but a province), Danish court circles were strongly opposed to the Germans. Izvolsky took these moods as a matter of course. a clear guide to action ... Yes, and the seed fell here on a completely prepared soil: Alexander Petrovich was an interesting personality. Either a Mason or not a Mason. A career diplomat, he received his first major diplomatic appointment in 1894, at the age of thirty-eight, becoming Minister Resident in the Vatican. And the papal court from time immemorial century was a school of secret tricks, intrigues and ingenious, intricate political combinations. Then Izvolsky was an envoy in Belgrade, Munich, Tokyo, and from 1903, as already mentioned, he worked in Copenhagen.

A clever and inventive man, Izvolsky, even from Copenhagen, strengthened the Russian-French alliance as best he could. Including such - at that time new - methods, as the organization of performances of Sergei Diaghilev's ballet company in Paris.

Izvolsky played a far from positive role in the history of Russian diplomacy and He, of course, contributed to the preparation of the world war. He was a supporter of rapprochement not only with France, but also with England.

There were many different rumors about Russian-English negotiations, and the situation the secrecy around them unnerved both German politicians and the general public. mass in Germany. Well, this reaction was quite understandable. Moreover, at the end negotiations in the European press, it was widely stated that Russia, they say, even if victorious war with England would not have been able to receive such a "gift" that she got without a war.

Well, the "gift" was still "the one"! Only fools and outspoken, hired by London, newspaper clackers could say that England is capable of yielding something or something to Russia. in the interests of Russia, so that this time England did not concede anything, nothing to Russia gave... But

received a number of actual concessions from St. Petersburg. First, England succeeded in abandoning Russia's active policy towards Afghanistan. The Afghans traditionally hated the British and, what is significant, they successfully resisted. Also, traditionally, Afghanistan treated Russia well, which did not could and did not want to conquer him, but she could cooperate with him economically, and in perspective and political support. Russian signature under the convention with England deprived us of such a perfectly reasonable perspective.

The Soviet academician V. M. Khvostov believed, however, that the convention and England did not allowed "annexing Afghanistan, liquidating it as a state." However, in reality this was prevented by the selfless struggle of the Afghan people, who did not incline heads and did not lay down weapons, which the Afghans knew how to wield.

Well, the fact that Petersburg and London mutually pledged to completely abandon actions in Tibet, up to the refusal to send even scientific expeditions there, could look like a bad joke if this "joke" did not exist in the form interstate agreement. Russian, even by the beginning of the 21st century, who had not really mastered Siberia, "blocked" the way to Tibet, where small expeditions could hardly get Przhevalsky, Roborovsky, Kozlov, and even the artists Vereshchagin and Roerich.

The most "weighty" result of the sudden "favor" of Britain to Russia was an agreement on the division of spheres of influence in Persia (Iran). Academician Tarle was surprised at the "generosity" and even the "simplicity" of the British for the fact that "England gave (? - S.K.) Russia, the northern, richest part of Persia, took for itself a smaller and worse the southern part and thereby gave Russia the opportunity to occupy a very firm strategic position for further movement to the south, to the Persian Gulf, in case if relations with England ever subsequently soured."

Tarle was not ironic, and in vain. After all, with such a "generous" gesture, Russia was offered instead of unnecessary and failed adventures in the Far East, in Manchuria and Korea, to get involved in new unbearable and failed adventures now in the Middle East.

What a "solid strategic position"! Fragile stone, standing on which You run the risk of falling off and breaking your neck.

What is there "movement to the bay"! Not to the bay, but to the swamp, any movement led us outside, and not inside, our natural geopolitical boundaries, which ran no further than along the southern - southern for Russia and northern for Persia - edge of the Caspian Sea.

So the "gift" was from the Britons, as they say, with a flaw ... And with a double bottom. In general, the negotiations and their results were designed, firstly, for the final fastening Russia to the Entente, to the London and Paris stock exchanges. The second purpose of the Anglo-Russian agreements was to encourage further discord between the Russians and the Germans. I note to word that he had a hand in the conclusion of these agreements (one would like to write instead of "hand" - "hoof") British Foreign Secretary Gray, about whom in his place will be discussed in more detail.

Russia was provoked by the German plans to build the Baghdad railway: they say that the Germans threaten the future Russian dominion in Northern Persia. What is such the road would be a convenient route for Asian Russian exports, it was somehow "forgotten".

As for the future "dominion" in Persia, one could only talk about it drunk ... On the one hand, it did not have the strength. On the other hand, this was not need. Having absorbed almost the entire Caspian Sea, Russia in this region has reached their natural borders, and further southward advance would be geopolitical stupidity.

Lenin, by the way, assessed the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907 correctly: they are preparing for war with Germany. But the opposite flank of smart Russian politicians looked at situation the same. Pyotr Nikolaevich Durnovo (we will recall him later) rightly believed that any Russian policy that is friendly to England is thereby hostile to Germany, and Russia cannot quarrel with Germany and especially fight with her. More precisely, maybe, but without success for yourself. Yes, and there is no need for Russia, because there is no irreconcilable There is no clash of interests between Russia and

Germany. And over this opinion Durnovo Tarle slightly mocked. The Germans after the publication of Anglo-Russian conventions was not in the mood for irony. They are not without reason publicly declared: "The Reich is in danger! England complete political encirclement Germany".

Even before the exchange of signatures between Izvolsky and Sir Arthur, from August 3 to 6, 1907, Wilhelm and Nikolai met for the first time after Björke, this time in Swinemünde. Its atmosphere was also, so to speak, "marine" - "stormy" and unreliable.

Izvolsky, who accompanied the tsar, tried to slip the Germans the so-called Baltic protocol with a clause on the "elimination of England from the Baltic". Wonderful are Your works, Lord! But the deeds of Satan are even more wonderful ... The Anglophile Izvolsky suddenly showed (before Germans) clear hostility to England. Why did it happen? The

Germans (von Bülow was in Swinemünde with the Kaiser) judged correctly: Izvolsky wants provoke them, and then show an "unfriendly" text with a German signature the English. As a result, Berlin adopted the draft Protocol, deleting everything from it. anti-English. But in any case, this Protocol turned out to be an empty piece of paper in advance, because a truly businesslike and mutually loyal spirit was leaving the Russian-German relationships as such...

In the onset of the Bosnian crisis of 1908-09, to which von Holstein managed to to put a weakening, but pointing in the right (to war!) hand, Russia again deftly fastened to the problems of the Balkan Slavs.

Germany in 1909 twice offered England to settle their naval problems, but England evaded this, but the British government decided build two new dreadnoughts for every new German one - I'll talk about that later. Then there was another test of European forces - in Morocco.

IN 1911, with the arrival of the German gunboat "Panther" in Moroccan the port of Agadir, the Franco-German Agadir Crisis began, where the Golden International tried the Triple Assent to Fortress. "Panther jump"

was preceded by the occupation of the Moroccan capital by the French Fetz. In Morocco, Germany (especially the Mannesmann Brothers monopoly) had serious capital investment, and Germany demanded compensation. France threatened war to which it was initially actively pushed by England.

It is significant that the French socialist Jean Jaures in those days led an active propaganda against the government, claiming that the risk of incalculable victims of the war with Germany - a senseless crime. The wealthy elite of France I thought differently, but the reason for the war was really small. It

ended with the fact that in the Spanish city of Algeciras an international conference, where the "panther" ideas of Germany pinched the tail. Russia in the conference participated, but was already trailing behind the Anglo-French Entente. For the

Golden International, it was then, although dangerous, on the verge of an explosion, but play, probing. Before "brewing" a general swara directly in the middle Europe, it was necessary to test and evaluate a lot, including checking the readiness of Russia go against their own interests. By that

time, the Romanov Empire was mired in foreign debts, like a careless fly. in the web, but then even she began to twitch and ask France to go with the Germans to world. It would be very dangerous for the king to get involved in a war because of someone else's colonial strife.

Nevertheless, the Fetz-Agadir combination as a sounding was completely successful. After her it became clear that in order to involve Russia in the war, it was necessary to look for another reason - purely European and sensitive for Russia. (Looking ahead, I will say that in the end Russia stepped on its "Balkan" "corn"). About how

important France (and the Golden International as a whole) was keep the Russian factor in your hands, says the next detail. Although Russia provided the French at the Algeciras Conference on Morocco only lukewarm support, in encouragement, she received a new loan of 2,200,000,000 francs (843,000,000 rubles). And this loan saved tsarism, shattered by the first Russian revolution, from financial collapse ...

"Panther's jump" was also useful in that it helped to better understand the reserves of Anglo-German consent. In reality, they were small: during the Agadir crisis, England in the end, she announced that she would take the side of France. British foreign minister Affairs Edward Gray assessed the situation as follows: "In the event of a war between Germany and France England should have taken part in it. If Russia were involved in this war, Austria would also be involved. Therefore, this would not be a duel between France and Germany, but a European war." To

those who stood behind Gray, a European war in which Germany and Russia, Germany and England would fight against each other was necessary. However, to start it in 1912 it would be unreasonable for Capital. Although many years have passed since the Fashoda crisis, weapons have not yet been accumulated in abundance, and the "colonial" reason for the European war would look quite dubious in the eyes of the peoples. Therefore, interfering with side of France in a purely political and not military phase of the Agadir crisis, England passions calmed down for the time being.

However, it must be said that England, although it was part of the Entente, had within itself the forces capable of seriously negotiating with Germany if the Kaiser went, for example, to reduce the pace of naval armaments. Such a move on the part of Germany would be regarded in England as evidence of a clear peacefulness, and Germany itself seemed to be thinking in the same direction, as already mentioned. However, the Germans were prevented ... by the British themselves, or rather, those English "subjects", whose subjects increasingly became England itself.

Admiral Tirpitz agreed to get along with the British on the condition that the Reich reduce dreadnought construction program from four to three, and the British their own - from eight to four. With all the inconvenience for England, there was something to talk about. The director of the Hamburg America Line, Ballin, who competed with the British on the transatlantic lines, was inclined towards ideas of rapprochement with former competitors. He was supported by the banker Ernst Cassell, personal friend of King Edward VII.

Cassell with Lord Revelstoke and the oilman Gulbenkian in 1910 founded the National Turkish Bank and, in alliance with the German Deutsche Bank, gathered finance rail and oil projects in the Middle East. These were, of course, imperialist plans, but they did not throw into the scales of war and peace twelve-inch "weights" of shells, and rails and drill strings.

If England took a position in any political European conflict simply neutrality, then such a conflict most likely did not have a military continuation would. This was understood, in fact, by everyone. And just a peaceful option for stabilizing Europe is not suited supranational Capital from any point of view.

Winston Churchill, who faithfully served this Capital all his life in 1912, being the first Lord of the Admiralty, hypocritically suggested that Germany arrange "sea holidays", that is, to interrupt the construction of ships for a year and a half. In 1913 he is repeated the offer just as hypocritically. He was truthful and sincere in March 1912, when he declared in parliament that from now on he would build new dreadnoughts 60% more than Germany.

Germany, in 1911, once again tried to negotiate with St. Petersburg during negotiations in Potsdam to regulate the penetration of German capital into Middle East including railway project. The Kaiser offered to influence Austria-Hungary and stop its anti-Slavic intrigues if Russia refuses to support British policy hostile to Germany. Was Wilhelm

lying here? It is unlikely that he needed at least the friendly neutrality of Russia, and even better, an alliance with her. Yes, such an alliance would allow Berlin to look at questions of war and peace more freely, but after all, he would allow Russia to reduce military spending in favor of the peace we need. Nikolai

did not heed the voice of common sense this time either, and I "nag" a future war they began to gradually whip with a whip ... England was among the most active "coachmen", but diligently adhered to the position "I am not me, and the horse is not mine, and I am not a cabman."

The famous leader of the Duma extreme right, Kursk landowner Markov II ... Nikolai Evgenievich was known as a peculiar personality, representing is a classic, so to speak, example of "rabid" monarchism. A wealthy landowner, he was inseparable from autocracy, because with his fall he lost everything (all he and lost) ... In emigration, Markov wrote the book "Wars of the Dark Forces", where everything is misfortune led society out of the Masonic conspiracy.

Having no idea that the social process determined by an objective economic factor no less than subjective by group efforts, Markov now and then hit the sky with his finger. But he was not stupid in his own way, and, in any case, well-informed. So, he wrote: "As soon as Masonic influence drew Russian diplomacy into the arms of a Masonic-controlled "insidious Albion", Russian-German relations immediately escalated, and Russia

was involved in a world war. Markov

overestimated (or rather, completely misjudged) the significance of the Russian-French alliance and believed that it was he who kept Europe from war. But a sinister role England and the "dark forces" Markov caught correctly.

In fact, England was "propped up" from the other side. If in 1907 there was a strike 147,498 workers, then in 1909 - already 300,819, and in 1911

- 931,050. A decent

increase ... On August 11, 1911, the Daily Mail wrote: "The strikers are the masters ... of the situation ... The civil war - fortunately, accompanied by only minor violence - V in full

swing." It is unlikely that such new features of English life suited the English elite, accustomed to the fact that it is the master of the situation. And if Lenin put forward subsequently the slogan of turning the imperialist war into a civil war in interests of Labour, then Capital was also not a fool and led the matter to ensure that in its own interests turn the beginning civil war into an imperialist war. After all, such a war reduces the number of consumers and adds jobs.

HOWEVER planning the first military impulse from England was not the best solution for the Golden International and overseas planners of a future war. Rather, it was to use France. And even better - by Russia, but on her initiative war and topple.

In 1912, at first, the prime minister of France, and in 1914, he became its president Raymond Poincaré. Own man of the French heavy industry magnates, attorney of the Schneider concern in Le Creusot, a native of Lorraine seized from France after the Sedan, Poincaré was focused exclusively on war, as were the production guns "Schneider-Creusot". "Poincaré is war," smart people said right after The Golden International of Capital placed him at the head of the final military preparations of France and Europe. By the way, this nickname alone ("Poincaré-war") is enough to see the falsity of the statement about the sole de the responsibility of Germany and the Kaiser for unleashing a world conflict.

In order to regard Poincaré's rise to power as a sure sign of readiness capital of France for an imminent war, there were more serious reasons than catchy verbal labels. The very personality of Poincaré, his whole political mood is ideally suitable for war in so far as he was emphatically indifferent to the problems domestic policy, giving all of himself to foreign policy. Moreover, the policy is aggressive, revanchist and offensive. That's why Poincaré became president before the war France that his presidency was to become "military". Among that hundred or two the first behind-the-scenes and public figures who, in the name of personal selfish interests approached the World Massacre, Poincaré was perhaps the most consistent and whole expression of the idea of war. And his nickname in a sense was *mathematically* accurate. After all, it arose after "my cousin is war," said Raymond Poincaré's cousin, the great French mathematician Henri Poincaré.

Stéphane Pichon, Minister of Foreign Affairs 1906-11 and 1913 France, believed that if in the Elysee Palace in 1914 it was not Poincaré, but Clement Falière (President of France until 1913), then there would have been no war. An exaggeration, of course: both Falière and Pichon himself had a hand in the war, in its preparation ... At the same time, not in them, and even not in Poincaré, that is, in the performers, was the essence. War was made inevitable by the then the masters of the world - "money bags". However, the opinion of Poincaré's colleague means something.

It is also important because it once again refutes the myth that the only culprit war and its initiator was Germany. But some people give the initiative to Russia, and also foul. Although the role of tsarism in the direct unleashing of the war turned out, as we we will see, peculiar to disgrace ...

Chapter 4. The Balkans – a geopolitical trap for Russia...

BEFORE the start of the First World War, the "Poincaré War", there were two fleeting The Balkan Wars, which made it possible to arrange the scenery for the prologue of the World Slaughter. At the same time some tactical ideas and new methods of warfare were tested and fully developed in the near future. For some reason, they believe that the First Balkan War

between the Slavs is basically Balkan Union (Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro, Greece) and "Young Turkish" Turkey blessed and pushed tsarism. But this explanation is both superficial and incorrect, although outwardly it was.

Outwardly, but not in essence. Slavic troops fought not Russian, but French weapons, while the Turkish ones were German, and General von der Goltz actually commanded Turks.

The Balkan Slavs were closest to us both in language, and even, it seems, in hearty inclination, especially the Serbs. Nevertheless, Russia in the Balkans had to do nothing already because over the decades of her Balkan policy, she had in the Balkans only fragile glory, the graves of Russian soldiers and the boulevards in the Balkan capitals, named after Russian generals.

Morally, Russia had "impenetrable" positions in the Slavic Balkans, but materially, its influence was virtually negligible ... Yes, and the Balkan Union was spokesman for the interests of the Slavs only in the speeches of its leaders. Here is Nicholas' opinion Nikolaevich Beklemishev, an interesting Russian analyst, expressed in 1914 on the eve of the World War: "The Balkan Union took place precisely for the transfer of lands European Turkey to more solvent organizations that were burdened with this new obligation due to the need for war loans. By itself it goes without saying that a significant part of Turkey's obligations was intended to be translated into Slavs, as the most accommodating payers, and this redistribution was to take up the technical commission in Paris".

The question is, what does Russia have to do with it? And where are *its* benefits - at least economic, at least political?

The best help to the "Slav brothers" would be our internal comprehensive development that would allow a strengthened Russia to lead the Slavic world in the future. "But what about the possible interception of influence from Russia?" - perhaps someone will ask. Well, if the Balkan Slavs, seeing that the Russians are not inclined to shed their blood for the sake of their interests, from some moment cool off towards the Russians, then this would prove, firstly, the fragility of their feelings for us. Actually, the 21st century revealed this fragility even among the Bulgarians with all the

obviousness. Secondly, it would become clear that before the Russians in the Balkans did not have to "guard fence."

Alas, in the Balkan sphere of Russian politics, other moods set the tone. Russian envoy in Belgrade Hartwig was an ardent Germanophobe, Slavophile and supporter of full support for Serbia, but was Hartwig right here?

Of course not! Too often Russia has had to take the rap in the Balkans for those who he was not very grateful to us for this ... At the beginning of the 20th century, A.F. Koni was a contemporary Russian-Turkish war of 1877-78 - wrote interesting memoirs about that time, which also said this: "" Brothers "turned out, according to the general unanimous opinion military, "scoundrels", and the Turks, on the contrary, "good honest fellows" who fought like lions, while the liberated brothers had to be taken out of the corn"....

And here is the opinion of E. V. Tarle: "The Crimean War, the Russian-Turkish War of 1877-78 and Balkan policy of Russia in 1908-1914 - a single chain of acts, not the slightest sense who, from the point of view of economic or other imperative interests of the Russian people."

So it was, alas ... It would not be superfluous to cite the assessment of the General Staff of Major General Yevgeny Ivanovich Martynov. About the Russian eastern policy, he wrote: "For Catherine, the mastery of the straits was *the goal*, and the patronage of the Balkan Slavs was *the means*. Catherine on exploited the sympathies of Christians for the benefit of national interests, and politics later sacrificed the blood and money of the Russian people in order to it may be more comfortable to arrange the Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs and others, as if fellow tribesmen and fellow believers devoted to us.

All of them: Koni, Tarle, and Martynov wrote the absolute truth! Balkans welcome waved to Russia, but economically served the West.

Alexander II "liberated" the Bulgarians from the Turks and in this case provided Russia billion foreign debt! And if those forces and money that we "thumped" in the Balkans in 1877, in the name of the exploits of Skobelev, ten years before that, we invested in the Russian American Company in the then *Russian* Alaska, then Russia would not have had this Sell Alaska to America for pennies. But some people hold Alexander II for almost great sovereign ... Eh! ..

General Martynov used the bitter words "as if devoted to us ..." not with an empty heads. In his assessment, in Koni's assessment, no particular exaggerations are seen, if you know that the combat losses of the Russian Danube army amounted to during the Russian-Turkish war 1877-78, about 40% of the personnel, the allied Romanian army - less than 15%, and participation in the liberation of Bulgaria "Bulgarian militia" was episodic, and, accordingly, his losses were insignificant. Serbia also put up against the Turks

troops, but modest both in number and in their combat activity. And was Kony exaggerating when he wrote: "The shedding of blood Russian soldier, torn from a distant chicken hut, bast shoes and chaff, to ensure the well-being of the "brother", walking in boots, grown fat on meat and corn and carefully hiding from the eyes of his "savior" a tightly stuffed capsule in underground of his solid house with stoves and household appliances"?

However, the experience of the then "liberation of the Slavs", which cost Russia two hundred thousand soldiers' lives (and this is at a relatively bloodless time!), for the future we do not went. Tsarism continued to look at Tsargrad-Constantinople-Istanbul and I expected that the "brothers" would be help in such a campaign.

Now, already in the tenth years of the new 20th century, thunderous sounds were again heard in St. speeches about "Slavic unity" and the need to "support the brothers against non-Christians."

We know Beklemishev's opinion about the essence of the Balkan Union. But the opinion of the Balkan wars of the XX century E. V. Tarle: "Serbia and Bulgaria live ... by agriculture and cattle breeding, and for them ... the question of Macedonia (*one of the main reasons for the war with Turkey*. - S.K.) was ... the question of new arable land and new pastures ... For Serbia, the acquisition of Thessaloniki was tantamount to access to the sea, which was so needed by the exporters of Serbian cattle and raw

materials". That was the background of the conflict, reader.

What was the interest of Russia here, I don't understand ...

But it didn't exist!

The FIRST Balkan War began on October 9, 1912, and on May 30, 1913 ended with the victory of the Slavs. According to the mood and formal results, the war could be called national liberation, but its true essence was expressed by the word "rehearsal". One could only add one more key word to this: "reason" - a reason for Russia's new interference in other people's affairs, in fact, for her. Balkan countries played the role of living "tin soldiers", and Russia - a dummy manager. But from now on, Russia and the Slavic Balkans were connected publicly and visibly.

Not only the gymnasium teachers, but even the newspaper boys now firmly knew: we will not let the Slavic brothers offend either the "Turk" or the "nemchure". If we take into account that New Berdichev ... that is, the St. Petersburg Cadet "Rech", was in the hands of the Jews of Hesse and Vinaver, the lively "Birzhevye Vedomosti" - of the Jew Propper, the rollicking "Den" - of the Jews of Kogan and Bikkerman, popular cheap "Kopeyka" - Jew Gorodetsky, and Moscow "professorial" "Russian Vedomosti" - a Jew lollos (the famous Zionist Zhabotinsky was a foreign correspondent here), then the "truly Russian" spirit in all strata of society maintained consistently and consistently. In the mass Russian consciousness from Germany actively made the enemy. It was all the easier because Belgrade is not some kind of Agadir.

The words of Leo Tolstoy, spoken in 1893, that the wars of Russians with Germans will "demand all ... newspapers, and, as it always seems, public opinion of the whole

people." Is

it the people? Tolstoy himself understood that in Russia of that time "public opinion" was increasingly becomes in fact antisocial, which is why he noted: "... as it always seems". But what Tolstoy understood was understood twenty years after his warning, alas, by far not everyone. The

provoked meaning of the first Balkan war is clearly visible from the fact that not the former allies had time to celebrate the victory, as the Second Balkan War began, now between Bulgaria encouraged by the Germans and ... the rest of the participants in the Balkan Union, which were joined by Romania and ... Türkiye. Here

everything was "turned up" quickly: from June 29 to August 10, 1913. Bulgaria suffered defeat, and part of its new lands was jointly plucked by "brothers" - Serbs, Greeks and Turks.

Turkish shares strengthened somewhat, and now Paris could not be afraid of destruction Turkey, in which 63% (almost two-thirds!) of foreign investment was French origin.

In THIS book, I practically do not touch on Russia's relations in the 20th century with Austria-Hungary, and Turkey, but for our purposes these are completely secondary subjects. Back to top of the 20th century, Türkiye - the former formidable adversary of Russia - was not quoted, weakened and had stable and well-deserved reputation of the "sick man of Europe".

Austria-Hungary - despite the fact that this "patchwork empire" was torn apart by internal contradictions - and by the beginning of the First World War it was still strong enough and posed a certain threat to Russia.

Nevertheless, Austria cannot be a serious one-on-one opponent for Russia. could from any point of view. Suffice it to recall that the Czech regiments of the Austrian army during the war, sometimes they went over to the side of the Russians with deployed regimental banners ... Psychologically, the situation was perfectly described by Yaroslav Gashek in his immortal "Schweik", and Hasek knew what he was writing about: he himself fought and himself quickly went over to Russia. For

centuries, the Austrian Empire has been one of the leading contributors to European political "ensemble", and Vienna - the most important European capital, from which depended on the solution of important issues. However, if Prussia grew stronger, uniting all the Germans around itself, then Austria, as the second (and even first aid) state of the Germans, gradually became decrepit.

In the second half of the 19th century, the Austrian Empire waged an active struggle with the Prussian kingdom for hegemony in the still divided Germany, but even here everything was not easy ... So, in 1864, Austria, together with Prussia, waged a war against Denmark, which ended with the transfer of the provinces of Schleswig and Holstein under the control of Prussia and Austria. And soon, because of these same lands, the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 began. She finally dotted the "i": the Prussians won at Sadovaya, the Austrians lost and, in order to somehow stay in the European leaders, in 1867 they formed

"dual" Austro-Hungarian Empire, united with Hungary. Previously, Hungary had the status of a semi-colony in relation to Austria, but now the support of the Hungarian magnates turned out to be simply necessary to strengthen shaken imperial foundation ... The former absolutist Austria was transformed into a "constitutional" two-pronged state, divided along the river Leith into two self-governing parts: Austria (Cisleithania) and the Kingdom of Hungary (translating). And

almost immediately after that, Austria normalized its relations with the united under the hand of Prussia with the new German Empire, as well as with Italy. In 1882 was formed the block of "Central Powers" - the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy, which in 1891 was agreed to be automatically renewed in 1902 and 1912.

However, from the very beginning of the Triple Entente, the European role of Austria, already in appearance of "Austria-Hungary", was resolved: it became in the new political "troika" one of the "tows" under the German "root". In Russian affairs, however, Austria is and the matter strayed into a policy hostile to Russia, in connection with which the former "friendly" relations between Vienna and St. Petersburg during the Napoleonic wars were replaced by more than cool. And the growing desire of St. Petersburg to "get involved" in the affairs of the southern Slavs on The Balkans did not rule out the possibility of a direct military conflict between Austria-Hungary and Russia. But a one-man conflict was, as already mentioned, hardly possible: neither an internal political situation, nor the state of the Austrian economy did not allow Austria to go for an independent anti-Russian adventure. At the same time, Austria was direct, including including the military, an ally of Germany, as a member of the Triple Alliance.

All this, of course, was taken into account by the Anglo-Saxon planners of a future war.

In the RUSSIAN Balkan subjects, the theme of the Black Sea straits has long featured, not outdated even by the beginning of the 20th century. And since they are already mentioned, I'll say, looking ahead, what else one persistent delusion is the belief of many that in the The Great, World War, Russia fought just for the possession of the Black Sea straits and that it was with the straits that the Entente was going to pay off with Russia in the event of a common victory.

Alas, reader, Russian Ivans paid with their lives "for the straits" at the expense of future profits of the same Rothschilds. They and the Nobels needed the straits as owners Russian oil. The Straits were needed by French Capital, which owned the Donbass and heavy industry in the South of Russia.

"Russian" straits would also cut German interests in the Middle East, already for the glory of the English Rothschilds, and along with them - for the glory of the oil magnate Deterding ...

However, the British were more counting on the fact that the Bosphorus-Dardanelles "catch" of Nikolai Romanov would be shared by everyone.

Nothing was shining for us in the Balkans themselves, although in Russia then they thought differently. Eat an interesting document is "Note of State Councilor A.M. Petryaev". Alexander Mikhailovich Petryaev knew the Balkans well, he served there for a long time as a consul. Being already assistant secretary of state in 1917, he wrote: "England and France will not to promote the formation on the shores of the Adriatic of a large Slavic state, gravitating towards Russia. They will undoubtedly prefer the creation of an independent Croatian kingdom, which will fall wholly under their influence." Petryaev

was wrong - Yugoslavia was created on the basis of the unification of Serbia and Croatia just with the support of the Entente.

What is it?

And why not, if in May 1915 not in Slavic Petrograd, but in a foggy In London, the Yugoslav Committee was formed, headed by the Croat Ante Trumbich, and this committee played an outstanding role in the post-war South Slavic state

device. With

the help not of the Russians, but of the British... Even though the British Foreign Minister Gray calmly spoke to the Russian to the Kadet leader Milyukov during his London visit in 1916: they say, how is it Serbs and Croats will settle down, this is their internal affair, and it also concerns Russia, not England. It is not harmful for us to remember that supposedly dormant in Russia Bulgaria "brothers" in the 10s of the 20th century was most closely connected economically with Germany and Austria-Hungary. So, quarreling with the latter, Russia does not have relations with the Bulgarians. improved. But Bulgaria, both politically and economically, was more accessible to us (and and therefore more promising) than, for example, Serbia. But in the conditions of the bourgeois order of things the principle was: "The elbow is close, but you won't bite!".

And it would be correct to say that Russia, with its capital New Berdichev, at the beginning war hastily renamed into the Russian-sounding "Petrograd", was going to participate in world war, having two strange goals: firstly, to make Germany out of a friendly state as a mortal enemy and, secondly, finally allow themselves to be tied by external influences and debts, to become the fiefdom of foreign Capital.

Looking ahead, I will inform you that by 1917, the Russian debt to England amounted to approximately a third of the annual income of the Russian Empire, and this was more than England owed United States. Tsarist Russia owed France half as much as England, but in 1917 already "temporary" Russia began to unrestrainedly swallow American loans, increasing public external debt.

HENRY Noel Brailsford wrote in *The War of Steel and Gold*: "From 1854 to 1906 the City boycotted Russia. The 1906 loan followed the apparently inspired articles in *The Times* that predicted a political agreement (*and followed in 1907*. - S.K.). Finance and diplomacy in the modern world have become friends friend needed. If any power or group of powers held a monopoly on the world money market for at least a few years and deliberately used her for political purposes, she would eventually dictate her will to Russia ... Russia vulnerable, because it depends on its reputation in Western markets in exactly the same way as any of the republics of Latin America.

A "flattering" comparison for tsarist "mighty" Russia, isn't it, gentlemen, Putinists and liberals? In

addition to loans, another remedy worked well, about which I wrote bitterly known to us, Colonel Ignatiev: "Russia has long paid dearly for its technical backwardness, presenting a tidbit for foreign industry: no cost capital, one sale of patents, which bore the loud name "technical assistance", it was possible to remove any profits from Russian factories. "Technical Assistance" was one of the most reliable means for turning Russia into a colony and a good help for foreign espionage.

Of course, in Russia itself they were strictly silent about this, and for the "patriotic" Russian public they composed a fairy tale that is in circulation to this day about how well "Christ-loving" Russia will heal after the victory over the "Huns".

Time has added to this tale one more vile and deceitful saying: "Oh, if it weren't for damned Bolsheviks"... All

this "idyll" is shattered by digital data. Let's look again at the Russian debt problem... On the eve of the October Socialist Revolution, in 1917, Russia's public debt exceeded 60 billion rubles. Is it a lot or a little? Let

the reader judges for himself: this amounted to seventeen pre-war annual state budgets. At the same time, *external* debt amounted to 16 billion, of which about 9 billion were *short-term* debt.

What did it mean? And the fact that in the case of a "war to the bitter end" one of "winners", Russia, would almost immediately have to pay the West almost three pre-war budget. This is not counting the fact that out of 19 billion short-term domestic obligations of the Treasury, the share of Anglo-French-Overseas Capital also accounted for a lot.

Well, how can one not recall Lenin: "Is there an economic opportunity in the era "financial capital" eliminate competition even in a foreign country? Of course there is: this means is financial dependence and buying up sources of raw materials (*which engaged in Russia by the British and French. - S. K.*), and then all enterprises competitor."

So, as it would have been there under a separate peace between tsarist Russia and Germany, not I know, but with a joint "victory" whether tsarist or bourgeois Russia together with the Entente The "peaceful" conquest of Russia by the latter would be ensured!

The Balkans became a political trap for Russia, foreign loans became a financial and economic one. The future world war was supposed to snap these traps, in which was drawn into Russia.

Later, having become acquainted with Durnovo's note, we will see that some of the Russian the ruling elite saw such a threat before the war, but ... But even appeals directly to Nicholas were in vain. Before

the war, Russia's gold reserves weighed more than two and a half thousand tons. External debt, which arose as a result of military spending, immediately "ate" four-fifths this golden mountain, mined by Russian people from Russian bowels. What a future allegedly Russia of the Romanovs and Witte sent millions to the western borders of the empire Ivanov in gray overcoats, tearing them away from millions of Marys.

And only the bright flowers of Ivan da Marya, blooming in the spring over those who have gone into the ground soldiers, later reminded of lives, destinies and love ruined in vain.

The BALKAN wars made it possible to set the penultimate points. All major the participants in the future European and world conflict in the series of meetings and negotiations caused by these wars once again looked at each other and the enemy at the enemy. someone was more ready, some less, but it was already possible to start.

Kaiser Wilhelm was confident both in himself and in Germany. And he had reason to do so. Even the famous French politician Edouard Herriot is a convinced antagonist of Germany throughout his long life - admitted: "Germany opposes us, in addition to a formidable army, an impressive organization. She extracts benefiting from everything, drawing from all areas of practice and mind. And Germany really was ready to mobilize, the people were really united and organized.

And Russia? On the one hand, the Russian "top" swaggered. On the other hand, the state of affairs in Russia could be clarified for oneself, having familiarized themselves with at least such a pearl official thought, as a decision of the tsarist government of December 15, 1909, where stated the following: "Improvement of methods of movement in air space and practical testing of new inventions should be persuasion of the Council of Ministers, it is predominantly a subject of private initiative".

By the beginning of the war, thanks to the talent and energy of Igor Sikorsky, we had, however, the Ilya Muromets heavy bomber, but the overall picture was bleak: Germany produced during the war up to 2000 aircraft per month (here and the maximum reached monthly level is indicated below), France - 2500, England - 2700, USA - 2650, and even Italy - 1000. And Russia - 215 (two hundred and fifteen). But the data

on vehicles ... When mobilizing the armies of the warring countries, they received the following number of cars: French - about 5,500 trucks and about 4,000 cars; English - 1141 trucks and tractors, 213 cars and semi-trucks cars and 131 motorcycles; German - 3500 trucks and 500 cars, and Russian - only

475 trucks, but 3562 cars.

In other words, if in developed European countries the car has already become element of the economy, then in Russia it was still a luxury item on demand "pure" aristocratic and bourgeois public. As for Nikolai

Romanov, he was losing the last remnants of respect even among honest people from the privileged classes. In the summer of 1908, the Russian Tsar for the first time in history arrived on a visit to Sweden. Russian mission headed by envoy Baron Budberg and military agent Ignatiev boards the Swedish boat, which raised the Russian embassy flag. At the same moment, the Stockholm raid is engulfed in smoke: in our honor warships and ancient fortifications salute. The Russian squadron is

late, but here it is, with the royal yacht Shtandart in front. Budberg is preparing to transfer to the yacht, and then the commander of the nearby Swedish destroyer suddenly reports into the

mouthpiece: - They transmit from the yacht: "Do not take the envoy on board!". Proud Budberg turns purple, disciplined Ignatiev and a naval agent Petrov is silent, perplexed. On the shore they will find out: they did not want to be allowed to the highest breakfast.

And a year before this royal trick, the Swedes met Wilhelm II on the same road and watched as the stalled yacht Hohenzollern received the envoy of Germany. Wilhelm went out to the gangplank, took off his cap and, in front of the eyes of the Swedish squadron, kissed him three times High Representative of the Reich in Sweden.

However, the Stockholm episode was only an intermediate link. In Russia for a long time they said: "It began with Khodynka, and it will end with Khodynka" ...

But how did it start?

And here's

how ... In May 1895, Nicholas II and Empress Alexandra Feodorovna ("Alix") were crowned in the ancient capital of Moscow. Among the coronation celebrations there were festivities on the Khodynka field. From the "kings" were promised a bag of sweets, a roll and a piece of sausage and a "coronation" commemorative mug.

"Gostintsev" prepared 400 thousand, and the cellar "for the holiday" about half a million! IN during the usual time, military exercises were held here, the field was dug up and dug up with ditches and trenches. They were covered with boards, but what did these boards mean when half a million people? People came in advance, a day in advance, accumulated, there was a wild heat.

They began distributing bags, the crowd succumbed, the first crushed screamed. And after a couple hours, only about 1300 corpses were taken away from the field (according to official data, and according to unofficial - about four thousand). In total, 10,000 people were affected.

What happened next, reader? We have a document written personally by Him Imperial Majesty. Nikolai was a scrupulous person and kept a diary almost until his own execution. Here are the records of those days ...

May 18th. Saturday

Until now, everything went, thank God, like clockwork, but today there was a great sin. On Khodynka field there was a terrible stampede, and terribly add, trampled about 1300 people!! I learned about it at 10½ o'clock; disgusting impression left from this news. At 12½ we had breakfast and then Alix and I went to Khodynka. Actually, there There was nothing; the music kept playing the anthem and "Glory!" Dinner at Mom's at 8 o'clock. Let's go to a ball at Montebello (*French ambassador to Russia. - S.K.*). It was very nicely set up. After dinner we left at 2 o'clock on *May 19. Sunday*

In the morning the real

hell began. At 11 o'clock. went to dinner. At 2 o'clock Alix and I drove to Staro-Ekaterininskaya hospital, where they went around all the barracks and tents in which

unfortunate, injured yesterday. We went straight to Alexandria, where we had a good walk. At 7 o'clock the banquet began. At 9½ o'clock we went to the village of Sergei. Drank tea.

May 20. Monday It was

a great day. Let's go to mass (*not to a memorial service!* - S.K.) at the Chudov Monastery. IN 3 hours went with Alix to the Mariinsky hospital, where he examined the second group of the wounded. Here there were 3-4 severe cases (*that is, the "kings" were shown a few victims.* - S.K.). had dinner with Mom. At 10½ we went to the governor-general's ball. May

21st. Tuesday We

got up late with a wonderful morning. At 11½ we went to the Khodynka camp (*not on the field - to grieve, but to the parade show.* - S.K.). After the prayer, all parts went well. At 3¼ we went to Alexandria, where we walked and drank tea. At 10¾ we went to the ball in Dvoryanskoye meeting".

And

that's all ... There is not a word more about the tragedy. But it goes like a stream: we rode a boat, ate, drank tea, honey, dined,

dined. And climbed the

same piece in the throat! Later, Russia will remember him both quadrilles to the groans of the dying, and dinners to te

orphans. The Kaiser, on the other hand, was very popular in the country ... In March 1913, our shipbuilder academician Alexei Nikolaevich Krylov set sail in German steamer "Meteor" as chairman of the Special Commission for the Study sedative sisters of Fram. These heaves at sea in the sphere of politics are not worked, but the common work united the Russian engineer and the senior mechanic well "Meteor" by the German Schroeder. In the evenings they whiled away the time in long conversations, and somehow Schroeder said animatedly: "Oh,

our Kaiser knows how to find a way to simple hearts!" "And to your heart of an old sea dog, too?" Krylov asked jokingly. - Alexei Nikolaevich, judge for yourself ... Once we gathered in a company in Hamburg in modest pub for a glass of beer. You know how it is: it's raining outside, dank evening, and at the table - old friends and a good German song. Suddenly... the door opens and Kaiser enters. -

One? -

Alone, and even without an umbrella, in a wet overcoat.

- And

you? - Of course, we jumped up, we are silent. -

And he? - And he grinned and said: "What are you talking about? Sing to me "Watch on the Rhine" Yes, treat me with a mug of beer ...

- And you treated?

"Ah, Alexey Nikolaevich! Never have I sung so cheerfully! That evening I drank the best mug in your life! - And then? - Then

he sat thinking and said: "Thank you, friends! You are doing well time"...

And he left.

In such episodes, of course, they could not do without theatricality, the Kaiser to show off I loved. And the class warehouse of life did not disappear from beer "impromptu": at the celebrations of about the descent of the next dreadnought, the Kaiser was surrounded by non-shipmen with workers calluses, and the elite in tailcoat pairs and snow-white dresses, shining with diamonds.

In the crowd watching this from the side, the young Austrian Adolf Schicklgruber with a "Kaiser" mustache even silently resented such an unfair distribution of roles at the celebration of life. He believed that his true creators too are entitled to their share of honor and glory, but so far only looked enthusiastically at how the steel mass slides off the stock, dropping drops of "baptismal" champagne from the skin. A year will pass, and he will find himself in the trenches of the war, which Germany will personify Wilhelm. But did Wilhelm start it? And did the Kaiser want war, and not German military might?

There are many contradictions in the figure of Wilhelm II, which, in general, are inseparable from any imperialism, and even more so from German. Features of the Kaiser's character only gave these contradictions a special flavor. Academician Tarle - according to some contemporaries, and on his own mind - argued that the basis of personality Wilhelm had a deep instinct for self-preservation. Like, he never flew on an airplane, not went down on a submarine under the water, which, they say, was expected from him.

Well, not everyone can be birds of such a high state flight as our eagle Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, fearlessly flying in supersonic fighters and descending into the depths of the waters ...

Tarle was a purely civil, intellectual, from the fighting aircraft and distant from the submarine fleet, and clearly lost sight of the fact that in the days before World War I (and much later) aircraft that took off are not always landed safely, and the boats did not always resurface. And *in vain* to risk yourself Wilhelm, as a responsible head of state, simply had no right. Wilhelm's

biography contains many interesting and mysterious moments. Here, for example, one of them. October 28, 1908 in the English "Daily Telegraph" was published a conversation with the Kaiser. In a strange way, it was missed by the censorship and the chancellor, and ministries of foreign affairs. Later, however, there were confusing explanations that, they say, they simply did not read it, as if it was about some insignificant piece of paper. Meanwhile The publication of the Daily Telegraph provoked a more than stormy reaction. Wilhelm complained about England's hostility to Germany, spoke of the desirability of friendship between the two countries and reported that in the era of the Boer War he rejected the secret proposal of France and Russia for joint action against England.

In Germany, about the "careless", "reckless" interview also rose newspaper storm. Assessed as political and diplomatic dilettantism this step of the Kaiser and Tarle. But in such actions of Wilhelm, one can more likely see his clever probing, coordinated with the Foreign Ministry, and an attempt to upset the just-established Entente.

Use of the press by a leader of this level for the purposes of political sounding was new at the time. No, Wilhelm was not easy. And it's very difficult ... Count

Ignatiev, our military agent in Paris, who knew Berlin well, about Wilhelm did not respond disparagingly, although he did not feel sympathy for him either. "Among colorless monarchs of the beginning of the century such as Nicholas II," Ignatiev wrote, "Wilhelm undoubtedly stood out for his natural talent, fettered by narrow monarchical ideals, and with its dangerous fantasy served as a good cover for not at all fantastic deployment of daring plans "...

I myself will already note: Wilhelm served not only as a "cover" - and daring plans were not compiled without the

Kaiser. Ignatiev, once in Berlin watching the daily watch parade with an orchestra passing under the windows of his hotel room, correctly guessed that "this external drill was part of the combat education system not only of the army, but of the entire German people."

Well, the method worked, and Tarle, exposing Wilhelm as exceptionally narrow-minded superficial fanfaron, he himself, perhaps, did not penetrate very deeply into the essence of the difficult problems of building the life of a real state organism. But Wilhelm was far from an amateur in these matters. For example, he broke up with Bismarck in his views on the social question. Bismarck intended to sink the worker movement in the blood, Wilhelm insisted on social reforms from above and even put forward the idea of an international conference on socio-political issues. benefactor the Kaiser was not a working class, but Wilhelm's domestic policy differed from that of Nicholas for the better.

Why, let's not forget that the Kaiser did not rule in meekly scratching his head and other "Rasee", but in a civilized European great power. In order to understand today how the monarchs of Russia and Germany differed, how tsarist Russia and Kaiser Germany, it is enough to know how they disposed of their the most valuable asset both philosophically and purely militarily - people.

An ordinary German reservist was a better fighter than a young urgent soldier services. Moreover, the spare German non-commissioned officer was good. However, Russian The "unterzer" of the reserve was not very inferior to him, and sometimes even surpassed him in command, combat qualities and educational abilities - then from the royal non-commissioned officers they turned out to be quite good Soviet generals. In education, there was, of course, a difference between a German and a Russian, but many years of difficult "tsarist" service made it possible to develop in Russia quite conditioned junior commanders. And this

reserve, this, without exaggeration, the "gold reserve" of the Russian army, the general mobilization drove *the rank and file* into service ! Ready-made sergeants and platoons in the very first the months of the war laid down their lives in Galicia, in East Prussia. Learn now there was no one to recruit a Russian

recruit. And the Germans did "exactly the opposite." Their reserve non-commissioned officers, enriched in addition to the past army experience, have become reliable the backbone of the German

troops. As you can see, Wilhelm and his generals - unlike "Cousin Nika" and his mediocre generals - they understood well that "cadres decide everything."

MILITARIST propaganda in Germany was put on a grand scale, with taking into account the theatrical inclinations of her "first soldier" - Kaiser Wilhelm.

This soldier himself was, I repeat, posturing is not alien. So, with the outbreak of the World War, he attached to his car a siren with the leitmotif of the "always looking for a new" god Wotan from the Wagnerian opera Der Ring des Nibelungen. The Kaiser's car raced through Berlin, his overtook the motives of the "coming victory", and all this was quite in the spirit, the German masses approved.

However, the craving for pose and effect did the Germans a disservice. Reasons to poke in their finger side they gave more than enough. General Brusilov in the summer of 1914 rested in German Kissingen. The Sarajevo crisis has already begun, which will be discussed later, the Germans cursed the Serbs, and at the same time the Russians who stood up for them.

A model of the Moscow Kremlin was erected on the central square of Kissingen and under the thunder of the combined orchestra is set on fire from all sides. Brusilov recalled: "Smoke, fumes, roar crumbling walls. Bell towers and crosses tilted and fell to the ground. Crowd applauded, and her fury knew no bounds. Above the ashes of our palaces and churches, under the roar of fireworks blared the German national anthem."

Brusilov's story is clearly true, and the picture drawn in it is impressive, nothing say. And among the documents of that era there is enough reliable evidence that that summer the Germans were ready to fight no longer with mock-ups. But being ready for war is not means to start it. And stupid chauvinism is equally disgusting in all countries. It won't pass and month, when a crowd of vandals encouraged by the tsarist authorities in St.

plunder not a model, but the German embassy. Valuable art works will irretrievably perish.

Collections of Ambassador

Pourtales. As for the burning models of the Kremlin, they will backfire on the Germans on the big historical distance. The restless novelist Valentin Pikul will also mention them.

But how!

Correcting a historical fact in the right direction is sometimes not so difficult. For this it is necessary to tear him out of the life of the epoch to which the fact belongs. Pikul and acted: he spoke about the Russian St. Basil the Blessed collapsing into German fire - fake, and next to him he mentioned Bismarck, and ...

And *the facto* montage is ready: the reader's subconsciousness is filled with the idea that The Germans, in their dreams, burned Russian Kremlins already in Bismarckian times. And somehow it is forgotten that not a model, but a real Kremlin was burned (it happened in our history) by "nice, charming" French. In 1812 ... But Pikul's pseudo-

historical

"montages" in 1914 were still far away. For now militant performances in German squares allowed the Franco-Russian Entente to assure that Berlin is about to start a war.

Academician Khvostov in the capital Soviet "History of Diplomacy" as most convincing evidence that "it was Germany that started the war in August 1914," quotes a letter from the German Secretary of State Jagow to the ambassador in London: "Basically Russia is not ready for war now. France and England also do not want war now. Through for several years Russia will already be combat-ready. Then she will crush us with the number of her soldier; its Baltic Fleet and strategic railroads will already be built. Our the group is weakening (*meaning the decrepitude of Austria-Hungary*. - S.K.). In Russia it they know it well and therefore, of course, they want a few more years of peace."

These lines of von Jagow have become classically famous, they are cited by everyone, however...

However, von Jagow wrote this to Prince Lichnowski, a staunch Angloman and Anglophile! Later, Jagow would even accuse Lichnowski of being too pandering to England. But Jagow himself during the war he was a supporter of reconciliation with England, the conclusion of a separate peace with us. He complained: "It is a pity that in Russia there is no authoritative power and the peasant must expire blood" ... If

only the Germans were aggressive (in relation to Russia), then how then should one understand that it was not the Kaiser, but the Slavic "Mlada Bosna", "People's Choice", the Serbian officer secret organization "Union or Death" (also known as the "Black Hand") created the pretext that led Russia into the trenches? June 28, 1914 in Bosnia, in Sarajevo, the heir to the Austrian throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, who arrived there to maneuver the Austrian army, was killed.

Serbian counterintelligence and its chief colonel were involved in the assassination attempt Dragutin Dmitrievich, he is also the leader of the "Black Hand" nicknamed "Apis" ("apis" in Latin - "bee", and Dragutin was nicknamed that way in adolescence). Apis was

also the name of the sacred bull of the ancient Egyptian god Osiris. The bull was associated with the cult of the dead: he contributed to an increase in the number of sacrifices. (It is interesting that Valentin Pikul, obviously not knowing the exact meaning of the nickname "Apis", attributed to him just "bovine genealogy").

However, it was the second symbolism that fully justified itself. cult of the dead Dmitrievich - "Apis" did serve ... True, "Apis" did not serve him alone: back in May he received a provocative telegram from ... the Russian General Staff, which informed the Serbian General Staff about the impending de attack of Austria-Hungary on Serbia. False it was reported that this was decided at a meeting (really former) of Wilhelm and Archduke in the Bohemian castle Konopishte near Prague. And the maneuvers announced by the Austrians

allegedly only a screen for the concentration of troops on the Serbian border.

Russian military agent (attache) Count Ignatiev wrote later: "A lot of mysterious and inexplicable, especially in Russian affairs, left behind the world war. Recalling the pre-war impressions of the Russian General Staff, the count also reflected: "How, for example, can one explain that at the head of the most important secret business - intelligence - turned out to be officers with such non-Russian names as Monkevits, patronymic Avgustovich and an Enkel named Oscar?"

The Soviet historian Mikhail Pokrovsky directly believed that the assassination of Franz Ferdinand was provoked by the Russian General Staff. Well, it may very well be, but on the one hand amendment: *by certain* circles in the Russian General Staff, connected with *certain* circles in Russia and outside it. Knew, it seems,

about the preparation of the assassination and the Serbian Prime Minister Pasic. No less significant are the opinions that the murder was organized in Vienna. If follow the last hours of the life of the doomed archduke, it becomes like that *this is also* true. The

"security measures" taken in Sarajevo in connection with the Archduke's visit guaranteed one is danger. Slow driving through crooked streets, crowds of people and ... on purpose a place cleared of people for a bomber.

However, the first assassination attempt that day, with a thrown bomb, was unsuccessful. The bomb flew under the wheels of the rear car and wounded the adjutant of the Archduke.

Instead of stopping traveling, the safety officer feldzkehmeister Potiorek again carries Franz Ferdinand through the streets and does not even covers him with bodyguards on the running boards. On the left side of the heir and his wife Count Harrach voluntarily insures, but Gavrilo Princip thrusts into the august couple a series of bullets from the right footboard. Just when Potiorek orders the driver slow down.

Franz Ferdinand was married to a Slavic Czech Countess Chotek (Princip shot and her) - and had plans to create a Western Slavic state within a single empire. Hitler, who did not sympathize with Franz Ferdinand, in "Mein kampf" even called him "great friend of the Slavs." The future Fuhrer here, of course, gave the Archduke too much a certain characteristic, but such even vague designs increased both the number of friends of the heir to the Austrian throne, and, of course, enemies. Emperor Franz Joseph was old, in 1914 he was 84 years old, and in 1916 he died. Borrow it place Franz Ferdinand in peace, the war might not have started, but it might Russian-Austrian détente begins...

I don't know why the former British diplomat was drawn to frankness Edward Grey, but in his "Memoirs" he admitted: "The world will probably never the whole ins and outs of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand will be told. Perhaps in there is no world and there was not even a person who knew everything that was required about this murder.

Where, one wonders, Gray is one of the direct organizers of the war from camps of the Entente - knew that "no one" "knows anything" about the assassination attempt? Usually so write people not only well-informed, but also *involved*. But Gray's words give grounds for assuming in events such a parallelism of the actions of the most diverse forces, when all the threads really slip out of the hands of any individual person ...

A day before the Sarajevo murder, in his homeland, in the Siberian village of Pokrovsky, he was the famous Grigory Rasputin was seriously wounded. His former adherent (or maybe mistress) Feonia (Khionia) Guseva hit him in the stomach with a knife, then ran away from men chasing after her shouting "I'll kill the Antichrist anyway!", and even then she tried slaughter yourself.

During the arrest, a copy of the newspaper Svet was confiscated from Guseva with an article about Rasputin, a major mason Amfiteatrov, who lived in Paris since 1905. And the next day, in Sarajevo, Gavrilo Princip was more fortunate than Guseva in Pokrovsky: the Archduke was killed.

The author is by no means a fan of Rasputin. Cross matching historical data does not allow us to doubt that: a) Rasputin really healed the hemophiliac prince, and this somewhat excuses Alexei's mother is like a mother, but does not in the least whitewash her as an empress, confidentially who approached a rogue; b) Rasputin was, as they say, a "charmer" and could people, especially with unstable psyche (as was the case with the imperial family), to charm; c) Rasputin was an obvious and very vile puppet in the hands of those "dark forces" which stuck in the teeth of both the "left", and "right", and the "center". But ...

But what is also beyond doubt is that Rasputin, on the question of war thought correctly and did not want a war with Germany *that was unnecessary for Russia*. I didn't want to myself, in addition to someone's influences ...

In common sense, this illiterate, but quick-witted peasant cannot be denied, and he He reasoned simply: "Germany is a royal country. Russia - too ... Fight them with each other call for a revolution. Revolution - the kings "on the hat." And where are *Grigory* then ? That's it! In

the same way (literally the same, only adjusted for the difference in the dictionaries of a peasant and monarch) from the heights of education and the throne, Wilhelm II argued in his letters to Nicky. The Kaiser persistently dissuaded Nicholas from friendship with the "republican" France, which cut off the head of Louis XVI.

It was, of course, not a matter of republicanism, but "Willy", obviously not without reason, believed that such arguments would reach "Nika" faster. For us, one thing is essential here: the Kaiser talked about the world. Even if as a guarantee against revolutions, but the world!

Preservation of the world as a goal and task redeems everything! No wonder the Russian people know firmly: "A bad peace is better than a good quarrel"! But it is unlikely that the Russian tsar knew proverbs and sayings Russian people, and certainly he did not know their needs, nor the ways leading Russia to a smart and a peaceful future... The

tsar reacted sourly to Wilhelm's advice. However, Rasputin's influence on Nikolai was clearly more than Wilhelm's. In the royal diary, the name of the "old man" comes across wrong too often, but this rather proves that Rasputin was as holy to the tsar as God, the name which it is not recommended to mention in vain. So the "holy devil" Gregory could be that particular factor that could cause a general change in policy, that is, the refusal Nicholas at a decisive moment from the war, despite the external pressure of the environment. After all "Gregory" was an element in the inner life of a stubborn and headstrong emperor, and therefore, the "Rasputin" factor was worth a lot!

Here, according to the testimonies of knowledgeable participants in the era, Rasputin decisively thwarted Russia's participation in the First Balkan War. The logic here was the same: "where, they say, we poking around, kady here, at home, not everything is in order ... ". And, oddly enough, Rasputin played the role here state positive, although in this fact the perversion, aimlessness of the Russian autocracy manifested itself quite clearly.

The well-known modern historian Alexander Bushkov does not always evaluate events deep, but his eye is not only sharp, but often true. In his book *The Russia That Wasn't*, Bushkov asks whether there was a the possibility of avoiding a Russo-German war? And he believes that the probability of this was, and the "key" is in Grishka Rasputin.

Actually, the "keys" to the war are always "golden" and not personal, but Bushkov does not mistaken that war was not inevitable. Despite the fact that Russia is a dozen for years they were preparing for war with Germany, the "German" war even in the early summer of 1914 and even after Sarajevo was by no means obvious to the vast majority of Russian society, including the broad army masses.

World War fell on the Russian head as unexpectedly as in August snow would fall on her. And under certain circumstances, Grishka, perhaps, could become that "straw" that would break the back of the "camel" of war. There are

those who wish to consider Rasputin as an exclusively moral figure, the leader of some "spiritual Christians" and the guardian-de for the Russian Land. All this, of course, is nonsense. But it's very possible, it's not stupid that Grishka really could to stab him on the eve of Princip's shots according to an agreed plan. And maybe not without reason The simultaneity of these two events - the assassination in Sarajevo and the assassination attempt in Pokrovsky - has long attracted the attention of researchers in the West, and especially in Germany, where some people sometimes say that it was Petersburg that was to blame for the

outbreak of the war. Mark Konstantinovich, the author of the well-known in Soviet times book "23 steps down" Kasvinov laughed at such versions, but he himself wrote unconvincingly: history, they say, "moves sometimes in too illogical, irrational moves."

The thought is strange! History sometimes moves really like this, but only for those who does not see how it is being moved.

And who ...

And why ... And the attempt on Rasputin very well coincided in time with the Sarajevo shots. Later, he said that if there had not been a case with the "cursed" Theonia, there would have been no war. And if there is reason to see the hand of *certain* Russian circles in the actions "Bees" - Apis, then it is all the more logical to allow their participation in the events of the Protection.

Kasvinov believed that there would be more historical meaning with a change results: if Ferdinand survived, and Rasputin was slaughtered. How to say. It seems that Rasputin was simply not cut down due to the racial habit of hack work. After all, even the Decembrists they hung them in such a way that those already hanged broke down and complained: "Oh, Russia! And hang something really do not know how". For a hundred years, nothing has changed: now they really didn't manage to slaughter.

Is it so, otherwise, but in the general scheme of events, such details were only dramatized pre-war background and gave it a spice. The essence of the situation was that the military the explosion became a necessity of the new imperialist epoch. England was

losing its primacy and wanted to improve its affairs by physically destroying military power of the main European competitor - Germany.

France sought revenge for Sedan and the return of lost lands. USA... Well, the USA has

almost reached the first world position, and now due to the war hoped to take over Europe.

And each power from this trinity of powers achieved its goals only by war! Only war could destroy the German fleet and undermine the colonial German requirements. Only military revenge returned Alsace and Lorraine to France. AND only a war, and a long one at that, made the United States master of Europe and the world and eliminated Germany as an economic competitor. Russia did

not solve any constructive tasks by war, the war brought her only protori and losses ...

For Germany, the war was desirable, but not obligatory, Germany, having provided itself military power, could be limited to purely economic expansion, but just this the Anglo-Saxons did not want to allow her.

Benito Mussolini - then still a socialist, pacifist and editor of the socialist organ "Avanti" - understood the balance of power better than many ... And on the day of the Sarajevo murder, he told fellow journalist Michel Campana: "The situation is clear. The Central Powers, attacking Serbia, thus attack England and France. General conflict inevitable." As

you can see, Mussolini, a smart promising politician, Russia as a factor in the conflict didn't even mention it.

Planned the war in Washington, New York, London and Paris. And here is the technical the implementation of other people's guiding ideas could be entrusted to St. exchange "New Berdichev" for a couple.

As for Berlin, Berlin, I repeat, did not want war as such, it wanted "places in the sun"

If the old colonial powers would make room in the colonies in favor of Germany, if Russia, instead of preparing itself for war with Germany, would actively cooperated in establishing economic coexistence, then Wilhelm and Capital Germany might well have preferred to war such a peaceful development of the situation, when the role Germany in the world would reasonably grow in the conditions of peace.

To find out who and how organized the assassination of the Archduke and what accompanied this would, of course, be interesting. However, it is more interesting to understand why the Balkans were chosen as the place of the act that became the reason for the war? The answer, however, is obvious: to *certainly* draw Russia into the war, for which the Balkans (and only the Balkans) have become the only "painful" point in Europe.

It is also clear who needed Russia's involvement in the European war, but not makes it difficult to dwell on a number of points again ...

On the one hand, Serbia itself was not averse to involving Russia in its problems, however, to explain the "Sarajevo" turn of events that occurred simply by calculating the Serbs on Russia's help in the conflict with Austria is not obtained. And even more so in drawing in Russia the Kaiser and Germany cannot be blamed for the war.

Yes, Konrad, Chief of the Austro-Hungarian General Staff, believed that the Germans are called upon to plant *culture* among the Slavs (Moltke Jr. spoke, however, about the future struggle between Germanism and Slavdom as a struggle between *two cultures*). But even competent military affairs, generals are far from always versed in politics, and even more so in economy. And the economy objectively provided friendly Russian-German relationship.

Yes, the fundamental German plan of the Chief of the German General Staff Schlieffen (who died in 1913) intended to hit France only in the first place, and after it defeat go to Russia. However,

the basis of the Schlieffen plan was detours - a kind of "strategic Cannes" ... In Europe, it really happened: the Germans entered France in detour through Belgium.

But in Russia, the Germans simply had nowhere to make a move with a horse, especially since before actually Russia, the Germans had to go through Russian Poland.

Therefore, Schlieffen had no intention of inflicting a decisive blow on Russia. He was sure that the defeat of France would bring tsarism to reason and everything would be limited to military demonstration. Accordingly, the guiding German memorandum had the title: "War against France". In order for the situation itself to force

the Germans to add to this name "... and Russia", Sarajevo shots were fired. Only by giving the confrontation with the Austro-German bloc a "pan-Slavic" meaning, it was possible to provoke Nicholas to war with Germany and count on broad approval in Russia for such a war.

Remembering the advice: "Look for who benefits," we will find the origins of the assassination attempt in Sarajevo not in Berlin, Vienna, Belgrade and St. Petersburg ... In all these capitals there were active supporters of the war, but all of them, one way or another, were ultimately free or unwitting puppets in the hands of those puppeteers who pulled the strings while sitting in offices in America and London. Moreover, not only the "elite" was pulled, but the masses were also pulled, because without stupiding them, it was impossible to ensure the success of anti-people plans.

Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich, uncle of the last Russian emperor, in his memoirs, published in 1932 in Paris, wrote: "Not one of a hundred million

Europeans of that time did not want war. Collectively they were all capable of lynching one who would dare to preach moderation in these responsible days. For trying to remind of the horrors of the coming war, they killed Jaurès in Paris and threw him in prison Liebknecht in Berlin "...

Jean Jaures was really killed by the crowd, which will be discussed later. But this the crowd had to be skillfully stirred up! And not all Europeans, even outside the crowd, individually, "did not want war" ... Alexander Mikhailovich himself reminded that the wife of the English Prime Minister Lady Asquith, in response to her question to Churchill: "Well, Winston, is this the world?" - received a cheerful answer: "No, the war." At the same time, according to Lady Asquith, the eyes of smiling Churchill shone ...

Still would! After all, it was *his* war, which he prepared and desired, *and he* And is ... he the only one ?! In

general, it was a war prepared by the supranational Golden Elite. However, not forget that the supranational Elite was made up of the national elites of the imperialist powers.

Almost a year before the Sarajevo provocation, at the height of the first Balkan war, Lenin wrote in Pravda on May 23, 1913: "The German chancellor is frightening with the Slavic danger. If you please, the Balkan victories strengthened the "Slavs", which is hostile to everything "German world". Pan-Slavism, the idea of uniting all Slavs against the Germans - that's danger, assures the Chancellor, and refers to the noisy pan-Slavist demonstrations in Petersburg. Great conclusion! Manufacturers of guns, armor, cannons, gunpowder and others "cultural" needs, they want to enrich themselves both in Germany and in Russia, and in order to fool the public, they refer to each other. The Germans are frightened by Russian chauvinists, the Russians by the Germans"...

It was said magnificently! And Lenin looked at the situation from the standpoint of a truly Russian a man of outstanding statesmanship. He understood very well how war, war in general, Russia does not need. Moreover, Russia was not ready even for full-fledged defensive war. And so Lenin his thought about Russian and German The chauvinists ended thus: "Both of them play a miserable role in the hands of the capitalists, who know perfectly well that it is ridiculous even to think about a war between Russia and Germany."

Alas, the last Romanov lacked both a sensitive political mind and a sense of Motherland. He went to war like a ram, and not even like a provocateur ram, but just like a stupid a ram led by others. But he, the head of Russia, led under the butcher's knife of the world Capital and all of Russia.

What can we say about the industrialists Ryabushinskys, Guchkovs, Konovalov, Tereshchenko, about Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolaevich? *These* , observing their humanly petty, but by no means penny interests, wished for a speedy war no less than their classmates owners in the USA, England, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy....

The already mentioned Russian monarchist Markov II smashed from the pages of his Zemshchina newspapers and the "progressive" bloc from the Duma rostrum, but I did not see all of it connections, naively believing that "as long as there was a Franco-Russian (*meaning - without England* - S.K.) union, there was no war, there was no smell of war." Markov did not know that a few days after On January 17, 1913, when Poincaré was elected President of the French Republic, he told the Russian ambassador in Paris, Izvolsky: "For the French government, it is very it is important to be able to prepare French public opinion in advance for participation France in a war that could arise on the basis of Balkan affairs.

This was said a year and a half before the Sarajevo assassination, reader!

Well, is it possible to show more briefly and more revealingly that the imminent war itself the geographical point of its initiation were predetermined not by the policy of Berlin, but the united policy of those either "dark" or "golden" forces, to which she adjoined the French elite, innocently credited by Markov as peacekeepers?

The first act of President Poincaré was the recall of Ambassador Georges Louis from Petersburg and appointment in his place of Theophile Delcassé - one of the "fathers" of the Entente with a reputation the main enemy of Germany.

Academician Tarle condemningly reports that in Germany this was perceived "as an insult, a threat, a hostile demonstration." Well, what was it, if not a frank, undisguised threat, not a brazen, provocative anti-German demonstration?

There is no doubt that the appointment of Delcassé was, as is usually the case, previously agreed with Petersburg. And from this Poincaré's trick acquired especially provocative and sinister. And then there's

Nicholas II, at the suggestion of Izvolsky and the Minister of Foreign Affairs Sazonov - in a departure from the custom of conferring on foreign heads of state the highest award in the empire only on special occasions - he immediately awarded Poincaré with the ribbon of St. Andrew the First-Called.

It all looked like the front line of the anti-German front was advancing France. At

the same time, Russia was its second echelon. But what about England?

In the END, the immediate European situation depended on the position England, although the very position of England was no longer independent, but was coordinated without advertising with Washington bureaucrats and with the New York Stock Exchange ...

Yes, outwardly it might seem that the situation depended on England only, and very many historians, even after the war, could not get rid of the superficial confidence that everything was determined by the inevitability of a "trial of strength" between Germany and England.

Of course! It was these two countries that were then industrialized to the greatest extent. In 1907, the percentage of workers and employees in trade, transport and industry in relation to the entire active population was 45.8% for England, for Germany - 40%, and for the USA - only 24.1%. Therefore, the US factor was considered secondary even such an encyclopedic historian as Yevgeny Viktorovich Tarle. In his work on During this period, he gave us excellent factual material, but he did not see the trend, just as for some reason the entire Soviet historiography did not see it. In fact, the growing rivalry between England and Germany was not so much cause, how much a convenient "drive belt" for the mechanism of promotion of the war in US interests. And, in fact, not even the United States, as the state of the American nation, but the United States, as the new and final residence of the Golden Capital. It is the supranational Capital now ordered political scenarios, painted roles and selected performers and directors. As for

England, the British side played their pre-war game brilliantly. She managed to completely subjugate the French and Russian foreign politics in such a way that outwardly it was not even noticed. And at the same time, England skillfully led by the nose and Germany, giving her the impression that England at any moment can and is ready to agree with the Germans ...

A year before the war, during the Balkan wars, England politically supported Austria-Hungary and Germany against Russia, with which it was associated with the "cordial consent" of the Entente. And inside the Entente, she got away with it quite well. Moreover, the Entente itself until the very September 1914 was truly only a "cordial agreement", because documented, by a special agreement before the start of the First World War, it was not formalized was.

Albion's trick, admittedly, is clever. No less adroitly, with the help of England, the "Japanese fears of Russia. Russia could reasonably fear Japanese action against it if the Russian army will be bound by the war in Europe. And such doubts were eliminated by the union,

concluded with Japan, one of the countries of the Entente - England. And, of course, English-Japanese the union was one of the additional factors that guaranteed Russia's participation in the future European war. And

how skillfully England put up a "smokescreen" of almost Germanophilia! Seeing only her, Germany was sure that England, in her conflict with France and tied France will not get involved with Russia.

The Kaiser was a brave warrior, but the British circled him around his finger like a beardless Fenrich ...

However, the "English" is a collective concept. In life, these were specific people. And it does not bother us to take a closer look at the one who, unlike the German Holstein, quite officially led the foreign policy of England from 1905 to 1916 ...

Sir Edward Gray (later Viscount Fallodon) became Foreign Secretary in forty three years. Well-bred, of an old Whig (that is, liberal) aristocratic family ... Restrained features of a thin and even emaciated face, thin, tightly compressed lips, a quiet (according to Churchill's definition - "graveyard") voice.

A staunch elitist anti-Soviet, Gray died the year Hitler came to power - in 1933. And, according to people who knew him well, he was a classic, sophisticated hypocrite, having one sincere passion - the study of English songbirds, which even dedicated a special work.

Here is a very lively characterization of him: "Sir Edward did not like to talk much; Same little that he said, he often preferred to express indistinctly. Gray's companion often did not know how, in fact, one should understand the speeches of the British Minister: whether to see in them a meaningful hint or complete emptiness, that is, a desire refrain from expressing one's own thoughts." A

childless widower, most often unsociable, who did not know foreign languages, he, according to according to some, "didn't like foreign policy."

It would seem that not the best candidate for the post of head of the foreign affairs agency the most, so to speak, "foreign political" power of the then world. But in your chair Gray sat for a long time, confidently, and in what is called "fatal" years. And he kept things in his hands firmly.

In short, Viscount Fallodon looked like a person, although not as eccentric as Baron Holstein, but also quite peculiar. And with the same "generic" signs confidant of powerful forces, who, however, preferred to rule through intermediaries like Sir Edward. The leader of the "liberal-imperialists", he was close to Lord Rosebery, himself, the relatives of the

Rothschilds. Accordingly, the main tasks of this "English Holstein" were: 1) fastening France and Russia to England (that is, in the future, to America as well); 2) drawing in relation to Germany such a *visible* line when the Germans would not be afraid of in the event of a war with the European continent, get at the same time a war with the English Island. The

latter is also called "lull vigilance" than Gray in relation to Germany and was doing. Gray above all and prepared the First World War with the Anglo-Saxon sides. He

later claimed that "for ten days in a row" he did everything to keep the peace in July 1914. And Gray was reasonably answered to such a statement: "Yes, for ten days in a row you did everything to keep the peace, but before that, for ten years in a row, you did everything to cause a war." By

the way, the former General Staff colonel of the Russian army, the future Marshal of the Soviet Union Boris Mikhailovich Shaposhnikov wrote about "characteristic of hypocrites Grey's strokes in depicting the nature of a future world war. Here it

is said, as printed.

He deceived Gray (more precisely, deceived Gray) Germany and indeed with a sanctimonious on a grand scale, without stinting on advances and promises. For example, in the prewar years, England allegedly went to conclude a convention with the Reich on cooperation in the Middle East ... agreement on the division of the Portuguese colonial possessions in favor of the Reich.

The "Iraqi" convention was supposed to be signed on June 15, 1914, but then the act signing ... "slightly postponed." The war that began a couple of months later turned paper convention. The

"Portuguese" agreement was ready in May 1913, initialed in August. However, Gray delayed and delayed its publication, and appointed the signing for ... the end July 1914.

It was Ambassador Lichnowski's unjustified agreement to delay the publication of the treaty for the Portuguese colonies, Secretary of State von Jagow later blamed him as the chief London miscalculation of German diplomacy. Although could the Anglophile Lichnowski refuse "best friend of the Germans" Sir Edward in his request for a "small" (just before the start of world war!) postponement? The

war arrived so well in time and so "successfully" spared the future Viscount Fallodon from the need to sign documents strengthening Germany, that the provocative line London taps on this one with complete transparency. Moreover, these facts additionally prove that the Kaiser was far from burning with the desire to start a war in the summer of 1914 of the year.

But Gray's colleague, First Lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill (whom we there will be a reason to remember an unkind word more than once later), with his inherent energy, cheerfully declared: "Never during the last three years have we been so well prepared." Background Jagow believed that England was unfit for combat, but Churchill imagined a state the English armed forces and industry are better than von Jagov. And confidence German Secretary of State in the unpreparedness of England proves one thing: the British deceived *and deceived* the

Germans. In addition to the moral portrait of the British Foreign Minister, I will inform you that when the creator of Sherlock Holmes, Arthur Conan Doyle, in the 1900s came out with an angry protest against the Congolese policy of the Belgian King Leopold, who flooded Congo with blood and tears, Sir Edward said that the hype around the Congo is threatening European world. Yes,

it's understandable! .. Push Belgium away from the Entente, and that, God forbid, will allow Germany transit troops through its territory to attack France. And how then with a convenient excuse for England to "stand up" for the "outrageous" Belgium and enter the war? Sir Arthur looked far ahead ... Immediately after the

Sarajevo shots, he once again defiantly emphasized de England's disinterest in the development of tension and managed to create among the Germans complete illusion that England will not participate in the war against Germany. It was the incitement is not so much subtle as it is quite dishonorable.

Then historians will explain the behavior of England by her supposed concerns about growing de German naval power, but here's how the naval forces correlated on the main maritime theater in the North Sea. England had in the "Grand Fleet" ("Big Fleet") and "Channel Fleet" 20 dreadnoughts, 38 pre-dreadnoughts (battleships), 5 linear cruisers, 67 cruisers, 192 destroyers and 68 submarines.

The German high seas fleet included 15 dreadnoughts, 22 pre-dreadnoughts, 3 battlecruisers, 25 cruisers, 137 destroyers and 24 submarines.

The total number of the heaviest ships of the superdreadnought, dreadnought and the pre-dreadnought type in England looked even more impressive: 66 against 37 German. That there was a clear advantage for the British, especially given the French fleet (though weak), as well as excellent coastal defense and well-protected sea bases. The British, and more intensively than the Germans, increased their naval power.

In addition, in the Baltic Sea, the Russian Baltic Fleet overwhelmingly outnumbered German forces, and the Germans were faced with the need to transfer part of the ships from the North Sea to the Baltic through the Kiel Canal (which they later did). No, it wasn't the Navy. First, England

wanted war only slightly less than the United States. Yes, America is at war promised only numerous benefits: an increase in production, a decrease in unemployment and social tension, the financial enslavement of Europe, the strengthening of its political influence and the creation of a mass army. And

all this - without the slightest risk to their territory, without the risk of losing the war. However, England also hoped to fight off only an expedition to the continent without damage to the island itself. And at the same time she intended to smash the dangerous a German competitor whose goods were crowding out British goods on the world market.

However, all these considerations could and did concern the English elite. What concerns an ordinary Englishman, then he will fight on land with his own kind (that is, with Europeans) did not know how and did not like. No wonder Bismarck once laughed: "If England landed troops on the coast of Germany, then I would simply order the police to to arrest". It

was not a little easier to move the masses of the British "on the continent", into the trenches, than to move the overseas "Yankees" to the same. About how with hanging "bells militancy" on the ordinary American, the US elite coped, we will find out in our place. But the technology in America was applied, in general, the same as three years before in England. Its methods were well described by General Fedorov, who visited the "Island" in 1915 with mission of Admiral Rusin: "Newspapers and magazines, posters and leaflets, public reports, patriotic manifestations, cinema, theater" ...

Nelson's Trafalgar Column was continuously delivered on a grand scale. booth for recording volunteers for the front. As a result, the so-called "Kitchener" army (named after Minister of War Kitchener) grew before our eyes: in a year from 200 thousand to 1 million.

Accordingly, British military production also grew, which was greatly facilitated by adopted immediately after the start of the war "Decree on the defense of the state."

Both centralization and capital control over the life of the country increased. And all these were signs of a new imperialist era. Previously, at least you could die in your own way choice. Now the Europeans were deprived of this "democratic freedom": front and rear acquired the features of totality. And as a result, the profits of the elite grew, that is, for the sake of which the whole cheese-boron strenuously and kindled.

The list of shareholders includes only one Armstrong arms concern, which, with at the beginning of the 20th century did not pay dividends of less than 10 or even 15 percent, there were names sixty representatives of the nobility or their wives, sons, daughters; fifteen baronets, twenty knights with the title "sir", eight members of parliament, five bishops, twenty senior officers and eight journalists. The war of this company could bring one thing - an increase in annual income by three, five, or even ten times.

There was something to try.

The English magazine The Economist, already during the war, let it slip in fright once - in the issue of February 13, 1915: "Philanthropists express the hope that peace will bring international arms limitation. But those who know what forces actually guide European diplomacy, are not carried away by any utopias"...

Sir Edward Gray was not fond of utopias. He and his patrons were well aware that it makes sense to start a war only when in it against Germany (and Austria-Hungary as an auxiliary unit) Russia will fight. Russia was prepared for this by more than ten years, and now the time has come to finally "squeeze" it and set fire to the carefully thought-out military European fire ...

Chapter 5. Shot at Sarajevo and Anglo-French intrigues

SARAJEVO was perceived differently by different circles in Europe. Murder the heir to the Austrian throne could, of course, be considered a "casus belli", that is, a pretext for war, at least a war between Austria and Serbia. But first Europe reacted to done with obvious indifference. Nicholas II in his diary about this event did not did not mention a word. At that time, an English squadron with King George V on board was visiting Kronstadt, and the tsar left for history only information about canoeing and breakfasts with George.

France, however, discussed the murder with fervor, but not of the Archduke and his wife, but the murder of the editor of Le Figaro, Calmette, who fell at the hands of Madame Caillaux, wife of the French Minister of Finance and leader of the radical party, Joseph Caillaux. Calmette published intimate letters to Caio to discredit him, and his wife responded to the provocation with a bullet.

Caio was not only poisoning Le Figaro, but the entire conservative, clerical and moderately republican press. Poisoning for the simple reason that Kayo - so obedient - with at some point began to interfere with financiers with his idea of a progressive income tax. In 1912, Cayo was "put on the surface" and too friendly tone towards Germany. His happiness is that in addition to the hatred of the bankers, he also had love an extraordinary woman. In France, this was *something*, and Henrietta Caillaux was acquitted.

Europe had to stir up, which was gradually done, although not immediately. Franz Ferdinand was killed on June 28, and only on July 23, 1914, the Austrian envoy to Belgrade, Baron Gizi delivered an Austrian ultimatum to Serbia.

But even after that, the Parisian "Petit Parisienne" devoted exactly twice to the "Sarajevo" theme less attention than Madame Cayo. In Germany and Austria, prominent military personnel departed in July for holidays, so as not to add political "electricity" to the July atmosphere, and so usually rich in thunderstorms.

In France, industrialists and merchants received cash income in gold they paid with louis and gold. Edward Rothschild in the country castle Lafferier threw costumed Persian balls. And in the early summer of 1914, "all" (that is, favorite) Paris saw a ball of precious stones. The Super

Ladies Swapped Jewels In Advance To Shine - Literally words - a dress the color of stones that adorned it from top to bottom. An eyewitness wrote: "Red rubies, green emeralds, cornflower blue sapphires, white, black and pink pearls merged into one brilliant fireworks. But most of all blind white and blue diamonds."

When the war became a fact, there was a chorus: "How unexpected!", "The war caught surprise us!" The French weekly Siman Financier wrote on August 1: "It took only a week to bring Europe to the brink of disaster, not yet seen in history." Well,

it means that Capital has carried out its many years of work in a qualified and carefully. And what does a "week" have to do with it if the French ambassador to Serbia back in 1911 complained: "The French state is at the disposal of every point in the world to le Creusot"?

And the Cresos are guns.

And here is another "drop", which reflects the era ... In August 1913, on the 9th conference of the Chiefs of the General Staffs of France and Russia (then it was Joffre and Zhilinsky) Joffre demanded in the name of the speedy concentration of Russian troops for offensive against Germany, lay thousands (!) kilometers of new railway lines, double the lines Baranovichi - Penza - Ryazhsk - Smolensk; Baranovichi - Sarny - Rivne; Lozovaya - Poltava - Kyiv - Kovel and build a new double-track Ryazan - Tula - Warsaw.

Even before the 9th conference, at the request of the French, the Zhabinka-Brest-Litovsk section was quadrupled ("some" one hundred kilometers) and a two-track track Bryansk-Gomel-Luninets-Zhabinka was built (here these kilometers were already dialed under a thousand).

Zhabinka, Baranovichi, Luninets, Sarny, Kovel, Ryazhsk... Swamp, forest, backwater places... The economic value of that time was zero. However, these were strategically important directions. On economic maps, small dots without a trace fell into a large-mesh grid of parallels and meridians, however, on staff maps they occupied the most honorable

place. The Russian economy would be very useful for these thousands of steel kilometers for unification into an integral complex of industrial regions, grain and fish granaries, forest and steppe zones. Instead, at the behest of the foreign Golden Clan and in its name, Russian artisans paved paths to nowhere through the impassable swamps...

Or rather, the path to war.
ahead

of time! No, to say that everything happened so unexpectedly would be reckless. IN January issue of the organ of the military ministry of Russia "Scout" for 1914 military Minister Sukhomlinov wrote: "We all know that we are preparing for a war on the western border, mainly against Germany. Not only the army, but the entire Russian people must be ready for the idea that we must arm ourselves for a destructive (*what a style!* - S.K.) war against the Germans and that the German empires must be destroyed, even if it was necessary sacrifice hundreds of thousands of human lives." It

was, of course, not only an anti-German, but also an anti-Russian provocation. Isn't it a similar provocation was Poincaré's demand that French loans be spent on construction in Russia of strategic railways stretched to the German borders? And wasn't the visit of the "Poincaré War" to Russia after Sarajevo murder?

The PRESIDENT of France arrived in St. Petersburg to meet with the Tsar on July 20, that is, before Austrian ultimatum to Serbia. And his whole visit looked like a challenge to Germany and simultaneously as a pre-war inspection of Russia. Tsar Nicholas these days ahead of schedule promoted the cadets of the graduating classes of military schools to officers and loudly declared that France had to hold out for ten days, while Russia would mobilize and "impose" the Germans "as it should." It is

curious that Sukhomlinov was dismissed in disgrace on June 11, 1915, on April 21 In 1916, he was arrested and imprisoned in Petropavlovka, but Nikolai released him. In the summer of 1917, already in "temporary" Russia, the general was still tried and on September 12 was sentenced to life imprisonment. And he immediately fled ... to Germany.

There, in a villa in Wannsee near Berlin, after the war, he could not resist confessing: "If anyone ever ... takes up the clarification of the behind-the-scenes history of the outbreak of the war, he will have to pay special attention to the days of Poincaré's stay in St. Petersburg, and also the following time from about July 24 to July 28.

Poincaré, I repeat, obviously came for an inspection, but this is the first thing. In addition, he came also in order to "cut off" all the "mooring lines" still tying Russia to peaceful foreign policy. And everything turned out as planned: "patriotic" anti-Germanism in Russia has reached a level after which it is necessary to restrain the "horses" (or is it donkeys?) for the time being, and not spur them.

The French tried to spoil Russian-German relations not only at the highest - presidential level, but even in small things. July 14, 1914 on the Longchamps field under Paris hosted a military parade "in memory of the capture of the Bastille by the revolutionary people." The flowery spectacle in a purely French spirit was over, the military attachés were preparing go home.

And then our Count Ignatiev was asked to sit in an open car along with his German colleague: they say that the organizers are afraid of the hostile cries of the crowd at German.

The car began to move, and the audience shouted from all sides: "Vive la Russie! Vive les russes!" ("Hurrah for Russia, hurrah for the Russians!"). Ignatiev was by no means eager for a war between Russia and Germany, quite the opposite. And, having lost to the French, he, of course, blundered - he did not realize that the German inside himself would be offended by such a deliberate demonstration of "Russian-French warmth" more than if he was driving in a separate car, and the French directly waved to him fists. But in the last version, he would be angry with France, and as it turned out, involuntarily to Russia.

What the French wanted. A trifle?

Uh, no! In

the same

way, the French will play dirty tricks on us in more than twenty years, already pushing the Third German Reich and the USSR at the World Exhibition in Paris in 1937. Then the French quite intentionally took the territory under the Soviet and German pavilions facing each other. And then in advance, to itch, they showed the layout the Soviet pavilion with the sculpture of Vera Mukhina "Worker and Collective Farm Girl" by the life of the architect Fuhrer Speer.

Speer set to work, and the final effect was amazing: inspired, forward-looking Soviet young guys walked from the USSR pavilion straight at the Germans, and the imperial eagle loomed predatory over them from the height of the German pavilion.

In the pre-war period of 1914, there were enough such "trifles" both in Paris and London. IN At the beginning of July (6th), the German Ambassador von Lichnowsky informed Edward Gray of the the Austro-German consultations ended in Potsdam and "in complete confidence" added: - In Berlin, they believe that, in

view of the weakness of Russia, it is not worth holding back Austria-Hungary. "Yes, Russia, alas, is weak,"

Gray agreed. He shook so regretfully at the same time.

head, that there was no doubt: he would very much (well, just very much!)

Russia was strong, but where, they say, can you get away from the facts.

Such insidious English "assessments" only inspired Berlin. And now a

Russian military agent in England reports to St. Petersburg: "English

The General Staff is sure that Germany is pushing Austria to war.

Well, still: the British General Staff, but in a conversation with a Russian officer, would speak in times like these are different! There is no doubt that they have always been able to provoke simpletons in England ...

At the same time, Gray assured the ambassadors of Austria and Germany, Mendorff and Lichnowski, of the strict neutrality of England and her desire to settle the Austro-Serbian conflict peacefully. On the eighth of July, Sir Edward received the Russian ambassador, Count Benckendorff ...

- I am extremely concerned about the seriousness of the emerging situation, count, - painedly said the head of the Foreign Office.

- Yes, you can slip on this slope, unless you have a strong spirit and resolute will," agreed Count Alexander Konstantinovich.

"Very well said," Gray perked up somewhat. And that's why I'm convinced that Russia must resolutely support Serbia and protect it from the arbitrariness of the Austrians. Your authority among the Slavs, your strength ...

Benckendorff politely kept quiet and only made an indefinite gesture with his hand: and you, they say, gentlemen, how are you?

Gray, however, did not see a hint, and Benckendorff had to ask this question aloud:

France?

Gray again became impassive and spread his hands.

- We are always on the side of the offended and in need of help, Mr. Ambassador. But on according to our data, then Russia will be in the most difficult position. I have exact information: in the event of war, Wilhelm and Moltke will very quickly move the center of the military operations from west to east. Germany sees its main adversary in Russia... Gray lied to his face.

So what? Two

decades

will pass, and the policy of provoking the USSR against Germany will conduct Gray's former Cabinet colleagues Lloyd George and Churchill in conversations with our plenipotentiary Maisky.

Another time, aged figures, but the goals and methods of English diplomacy are not will change. In the meantime, it was necessary to incite tsarist Russia, because without Russia it was impossible to start a war in every sense. The only reliable guarantee here could be either a declaration of war by Germany against Russia, or vice versa.

But it was absolutely necessary to ensure that the conflict took shape first between these two powers. Only after they got bogged down in mutual mobilization actions after the official declaration of a state of war among themselves, it was possible move the cause of the Great War further.

There was another subtle moment here ... In the already mentioned book "Europe in the era imperialism" Academician Tarle stated that the German Chancellor Bethmann-Hellweg was active supporter of the war. But here is how the Chief of Staff assessed the same Bethmann The Red Army Boris Mikhailovich Shaposhnikov in his work "The Brain of the Army": "A tragic personality - one of Bismarck's successors in the chancellorship - Bethmann-Hellweg thought to achieve intended goals exclusively by peaceful means, pursuing a policy of "no war". Bethmann proceeded from the premise that the rapid development of the productive forces Germany will be so far ahead of the rest of the states that their competition will be excluded."

Shaposhnikov fought with the Germans at the front. Tarle - on paper, accusing Bethmann of the fact that in 1914 in Germany they saw the main enemy not in France, but in Russia. And this is de how Tarle argued, on the grounds that "the victory over France seemed not easy, but quite possible; victory over Russia - both easy and undoubted. Well, let's

discuss how right the academician was ... There is no doubt

that if Germany had hit Russia first (and not

France, as it was in reality), then France would not actively intervene. What else is not

it was enough: to shed the blood of French chevaliers in the name of the lives of the gray-pawed peasant!

But the Germans would have been provided with the support of the Austrians. And that's not counting support. Yevgeny Viktorovich Tarle, who attributed to the Germans hat-throwing moods relation to Russia. So,

the "easy victory" of the Germans on the Eastern Front, a quick voyage along the western flanks of the Russian Empire, the annexation of Courland, the Russian part of Poland, Livonia with Estonia. Then

- reconciliation with Russia on German terms, and Russia is discarded from the accounts. After that, it was possible to take a break, so that with the advent of new warm days, hit already in lonely France. Well,

isn't this the rational scheme of war for Germany, if the Germans were so anti-Russian and were so arrogant about us, like this described Tarle?

In reality, the Germans strictly adhered to the French-oriented plan Schlieffen and on the Russian border were held only by insignificant forces. With blind hostility somehow it didn't work for us.

That maybe it was because our power was neglected? No, the Germans were not so stupid and ignorant not to understand that in Russia will not show weakness in a defensive war at least. And there...

And there - who knows? "Russians harness for a long time, but they drive fast," used to say Bismarck.

Germany did not want to give rise to increased tension with Russia. But reasons for enmity every now and then gave St. Petersburg itself - both bureaucratic, official, and exchange. What was the cost of one noise raised in the autumn of 1913 around the Turkish mission General Liman von Sanders.

Türkiye turned to Germany with a request to carry out a complete reorganization of its army. This new European-style army was to be re-equipped by the German arms factories led by Krupp.

Of course, there was little joy for us in such a surprise. We have friendship with Turkey there was nothing special, but there were real conflict zones in the Transcaucasus.

But the Germans could be understood. From such offers and opportunities respecting the powers themselves do not give up. Here, after all, both loading your economy and binding to yourself Turkey, here are the interests of the Baghdad railway. So make noise, don't make noise, but Germany away the temptation will not recede. It was clearer than

clear ... Looking ahead, I will say that all the efforts of the Germans did not really strengthen the Turkish army. After all, the strength of modern armies is determined by the general level of development of society, and Turkey of that time was "still the same"...

And this was also clear in advance... So was it worth it to ruffle the nerves of yourself and others? However, instead of putting a good face on a bad game and making the most of smooth out the tension by exchanging it for possible German concessions to us, Petersburg soared so that, solely on our initiative, it smelled of our war with Germany one on one.

Up to a certain point, Russia was also egged on from London. Sir Edward Gray pointedly made it clear that he would not mind thinking about the joint appeal of the three powers (that is, England, France and Russia) to the Port ... All

this was done, of course, so that St. relations with the Germans straight - straight to the maximum mutual bitterness. But before sir Edward could not bring the matter to war then (so her whole schedule would have been disrupted), and therefore, at the end of November, he poured a tub of cold water on Sazonov and Girs, saying that a collective note of protest was inappropriate.

In Berlin, Albion's ability to intrigue, of course, was not deceived. However, the irritation on us was great there. Yes, and rightly so.

We can hardly be mistaken, reader, if we assume that the nervousness described above Petersburg was artificially caused by stock exchange New Berdichev, London, Paris, New York ... The reason was very small, and the result was very serious: Russian-German relations were spoiled just as the interests required the upcoming Great War. Now it

turned out that by the beginning of 1914, Germany could already understand that Petersburg able to go to war with her.

The mood of France has been known since Sedan. But the position of London in Berlin was assessed completely erroneously, because England skillfully played the role of neutral.

The Kaiser, his diplomatic and general teams knew how to think, but did were they able to assess the alignment of world forces in the same way that these forces were already actually placed? The Golden International has already put at the head of its interests plan for the rise of the United States through a world war. A financial headquarters has already been established future war - the Fed, the US Federal Reserve, which will be discussed later said. And not only Russia and France, but even England was assigned the role of a boy for whipping.

Could Berlin think like that about "proud Albion", about the mighty "British Empire, over which the sun did not set"? After all, England - from the standpoint of purely national interests - it was inappropriate to directly get involved in the European continental war.

In Berlin they were counting on this, while in London the illusion was cleverly maintained. In the name of what? The answer, although correct, sounded strange: in the name of "victorious" war for itself, England ... became America's debtor and began to lose their world positions.

Academician Tarle wrote mockingly: "Subsequently, in Germany, with irritation Bethmann-Helweg and other responsible persons were asked how they came up with the idea so strange to solve the question? Why did they feel that they would not have to deal with all Entente?... No solid answer was given to this question. And in the very In fact, if it was very difficult to answer this question even in 1919, then it is clear that in In 1913-1914, not only Bethmann-Helweg was mistaken in this respect, but also persons who had more powerful intellectual means than this executive and conscientious bureaucrat in his own way."

Yevgeny Viktorovich was ironic about the German chancellor and his colleagues, nevertheless in vain. In the categories of *the national* policy of the state, the answer was really not found, and the Kaiser and his employees were, on the one hand, exclusively national figures, and on the other hand, they did not study the social sciences. And that's why they couldn't do it on time (and later) to see that the situation is already determined by *the supranational* policy of *the supranational* figures of the Golden Clan.

Thinking in terms of such "politics", the true masters of England were quite it is profitable and reasonable to lead England along a path that is unfavorable for England as a national states, ways, ways of direct European war between England and Germany.

The policy of the ruling elite of England - all those Churchills and Grays - was treacherous to England Elizabeth and Nelson, yeomen Robin Hood and London dockers, England of Chaucer and Dickens... So, could the nationalist, I repeat, leadership of Germany comprehend in time the logic of almost total national betrayal by the English elite of the interests of England and to foresee the scale this betrayal?

THE LAST week of July 1914 was a decisive but logical conclusion thirty years of work by Holsteins, Wittes, Grays, Rothschilds, Poincarés, Schneiders, Krupps, Armstrongs, Baruchs, Du Ponts, Sazonovs, Guchkovs, Churchills and Roosevelts...

Henry Noel Brailsford, already familiar to us, wrote for good reason before the war: "The international relations of firms trading in arms represent seductive subject for satire. Capital is devoid of patriotism. German firm is under the leadership of French directors. To the Nobel Trust and Company Harvey included all the leading armaments firms: British, French, German and American. The French firm Schneider and the German firm Krupp (*two the largest gun companies in the world.* - S. K.) united in a syndicate to develop iron mines in Algiers. The number of persons profiting from armaments and war is relatively small in comparison with the entire population of the civilized world. But their individual value is greater, they work in alliance with "society" (Brailsford *had in mind, of course, "secular, high society."* - S. K.), which considers the empire as a field for the career of his sons, and with financial circles, who consider it the sphere for investment."

Well said: "The British Empire is nothing more than an investment "societies" of large private owners"... To this general

picture of the unity of the Golden International, I can add a specific detail ... Shortly before the war, the president of the super-aristocratic Parisian race society Joachim Murat, a direct descendant of the Napoleonic marshal, following the example of many

Noble Clans became related to the Jewish Capital, marrying the richest receptionist daughter of the Alsatian banker Ettinger. The "touching" union of the brilliant Frenchman and of a wealthy German Jewess on the eve of a mass beating by ordinary Germans ordinary French... The

Golden Elite of the 20th century could no longer live without military income and without the war itself. She was preparing a war, and now its hour has come ...

But it has not yet come, because Russia was out of the game, and on July 23, 1914 So far, only Serbia has received an ultimatum from Austria-Hungary, with time for reflection - two days. The Austrian Habsburg

Empire was the weakest of the great powers, however slamming Serbia would not have been a big deal for her. The problem was that the minister Foreign Affairs of Russia Sazonov declared: Russia cannot, de facto, allow Austria "to speak with Serbia in threatening language or to take military measures against it."

Serbia indeed immediately after receiving the ultimatum asked for help to Russia.

The "logic" here was mutually strange ... Let us recall that Academician Khvostov assured through half a century that in 1914 only Germany wanted war (read - with Austria-Hungary), and Russia I had to wait a few more years because she wasn't ready. So why then, one wonders, did the Sazonovs-Romanovs climb on the rampage? Why Nikolay II in February 1914 irresponsibly declared to the Serbian Prime Minister Pasic: "For Serbia we'll do everything"?

For

what? After all, the king had already been warned more than once about the recklessness of such sentiments - the same leader of the "right" P. N. Durnovo!

Well, even if Austria occupied Serbia, what would happen? Austria would have earned itself another "national" headache, and

Vienna was enough even without the Serbs. Meanwhile, Russia would have strengthened, Austria would have weakened even more would, and then ...

Then it would be possible to move on to the next liberation campaign on the lands southern Slavs, if it wasn't so at home.

Alas, in St. Petersburg in the summer of 1914, it was not the guards horses that bit the bit, but the royal horses. ministers, allegedly Russian journalists and...

And many who, in addition, *are interested* ...

SERBIA behaved even more irresponsibly. It is generally accepted that the Austrian the ultimatum consisted of such points that, when they were carried out, destroyed Serbia as sovereign state. Sir Edward Gray was Jesuitically "innocently" "doubted" whether Russia to advise the Serbs to agree to the ultimatum, and provocatively added: "A state that accepts something like this, in fact, ceases to be independent state".

However, independently, sovereignly only the state that can protect itself military force. And if it can't, it should behave accordingly. However, Gray lied and in fact.

The ultimatum was really *harsh* in places : the Serbs, for example, had to dismiss officers from the army according to the lists presented by Vienna. But He still did not destroy Serbia, and in general there were no catastrophic threats there. Maybe therefore, the full content of the ultimatum is by no means always given even in thick historical works. And

acquaintance with the main document, because of which it began (according to in unison, both in the West and in the East) world war, gives rise to one thought: "Did they have Do Serbs have the slightest moral right to reject such an ultimatum at the time?".

One way or another, 10 minutes before the expiration of the ultimatum, on July 25 at seventeen fifty, Serbian Prime Minister Pasic handed the answer to Baron Gisl. Serbia took *all*

items except for one.

Reader, read carefully, and then think about the point that was rejected. After that how the Serbs accepted the conditions, if not liquidating the independence of the country, then nevertheless seriously infringing on her, they did not agree that the Austrian police simply participated in the territory of Serbia in the investigation of the case of persons involved in Sarajevo events. At the

same time, the Serbs referred to the fact that this would be contrary to the Serbian constitution, and proposed that the case be referred to the International Court of Justice in The

Hague. So, the Serbs rejected the only demand of the Austrians, which was just the most natural and legitimate, and at the same time the most easy.

If we recall that Serbia intended to defend its fate with Russian weapons in Russian hands, then this was, firstly, in fact, a response from Russia. And this was "good" war.

Secondly, in relation to Russia on the part of Serbia, it was a criminal and unforgivable meanness! After all, it turned out, in fact, that the future blood of Russian men will be on the Serbian leadership to an even greater extent than on the Russian ...

The Austrians immediately began mobilizing against Serbia, but on the Russian-Austrian the border was quiet. There was

nothing strange about it. Neither in Berlin nor in Vienna were they at all inclined regard what is happening as the beginning of the Great War. Upon learning of the Serbian response, Wilhelm wrote to Secretary of State von Jagov: "There are no longer grounds for war" ... However, at the same time he thought Austria should occupy Belgrade and part of Serbia as a "guarantee".

But the British Treasury is already on July 25 - the day the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia - started issuing special banknotes that are not subject to exchange for gold and intended in wartime. Are comments

required here? On July 28, 1914, Austria declared war on Serbia, and on the night of 29 artillery bombardment of Belgrade. In Russia, the General Staff immediately began to rush Nikolai mobilization...

The tsar was inclined to declare either a complete (against Germany and Austria), or a partial (only against Austria) mobilization, and Wilhelm urged him by telegrams not to flog fever. It really could not have been flogged, because Germany would never dealt the first blow to Russia. Her target in case of war was Paris.

But how can Germany start a war with France when it has not entered into a war with Germany Russia - an ally of France? Russia was supposed to start the war and start it with Germany, because without a collision between Germany and Russia, world Capital will war was not required. She, in fact, without the participation of Russia on the side of France, the world and would not...

If the tsar and the heirs of Witte had taken their time, then even if Germany had risked to fight with France, Russia would not be in imminent danger. Russia as an ally France, one could even formally go to war with Germany and (or) Austria after it would have been started against France by Germany (or France against Germany), but wage this war like the "strange" war waged in 1939 by France and England against the Third Reich ... It was possible to calmly mobilize after not started by Russia war and protect their borders. And

they would have looked

there ... Passive assistance to the victory of Germany over France, even after all the German-Russian misunderstandings, would be beneficial for Russia. But in St. Petersburg, the "Russian" newspapers are already they painted how the forelocked Kuzka Kryuchkovs enter Berlin.

The tsar was assured that if only partial mobilization was announced (against Austria), then she allegedly disrupts the universal (also against Germany). Silly, of course...

And under all this "patriotic-leavened" foam, a true desire was hidden: we must quickly call at least some peasant masses, put them under arms and throw them on Germany ...

On the one hand, this is how the world war began, on the other hand, the entry Russia saved France in it.

Russia was pushed to the forefront, but France somehow immediately began be careful. This was understandable: it's one thing to walk briskly in parades, waving with a sword in the direction of the "Prussians", and another thing - from day to day to expect an invasion of these same Prussians.

On July 30, 1914, the French mobilized five frontier corps and immediately out of cowardice, or out of precaution, they took their advanced units away from the border with Germany ten kilometers, so that, God forbid, not to give the Germans a reason for border incidents.

President Poincaré presented these measures to the Russian Ambassador Izvolsky as proof of peacefulness, and General Joffre reassured the Russian military agent Ignatieva: this supposedly subtle maneuver was foreseen in advance by the mobilization plan.

The FRENCH could afford such a "subtle" game, since the Foreign Ministry Sazonov with The General Staff did not forget about the problems of the "sons of freedom" ... In fact, immediately after July 23, mobilization began in the border districts of Vilna and Warsaw preparations, even before the official reaction of the king. Head of Chernihiv garrison, Colonel Mikhail Dmitrievich Bonch-Bruevich (later - a prominent staff General), received a secret package from Kyiv with an order to immediately bring units garrison in a pre-mobilization state on July 29 at five o'clock in the afternoon. And this objectively forced Germany to be on the alert.

But what is especially interesting, reader, is that our mobilization activity was strangely combined with our diplomatic passivity just where Russian diplomacy needed the sensitivity of a tuning fork, that is, in Vienna and Berlin.

Already after (!) the Sarajevo shots, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Sazonov for some reason (!) allowed the Berlin Ambassador Sverbeev and the Vienna Ambassador Shebeko to leave their posts. It is also interesting that this important and meaningful "detail" is silent almost all Soviet authors. And only known to us Markov-second on this occasion remarked: "In those very days when the fatal question was finally decided whether the world war or it will be possible to delay it at least for a while, neither in Germany nor in Austria-Hungary were there imperial Russian ambassadors: one enjoyed a vacation in his village, the other was gaining impressions in St. Petersburg. In

order to "round off" the effect, Markov often handled the facts quite freely. Not he turned out to be quite accurate here too: in mid-July, Sverbeev was already back in Berlin and visited Secretary of State Yagov. But in those days when something else could be fixed, our the ambassador was not really there.

And now, when the border districts had already mobilized, Sverbeev could only dejectedly to state in an encrypted telegram to Sazonov: "Having learned from me that we really compelled to mobilize four military districts ... Jagov, in great agitation, answered me that this unexpected news completely changes the situation and that now he no longer sees possibility of avoiding a European war.

While in exile, Sazonov distorted this opinion of Yagov, exposing the German as a sort of fatalist militarist, who believes that since conflict is inevitable, let him break out faster. But Sazonov recorded one of the creators of the Entente, Delcassé, as a pacifist. Obviously, Sergei Dmitrievich, after all the troubles and stormy years, considered himself also in the "peacekeeping" department, completely refusing their share of responsibility for the war. But the facts say otherwise!

In 1910, Kaiser Wilhelm met the new Russian Foreign Minister affairs and, letting him go, said: "Finally, I had to meet with the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, who thinks and feels like a Russian.

Sazonov bowed in response, and Wilhelm added: "With a nationally minded minister, it will not be difficult for us Germans to live in peace and good agreement.

Now the "nationally minded" Sazonov was afraid that he would be late with the war against the Germans. On July 28, Nikolay calmly played tennis, but ended up wrote in his diary: "The day was unusually restless. I was constantly called to phone, then Sazonov, or Sukhomlinov, or Yanushkevich. And

on July 29, Sazonov, after a meeting with Minister of War Sukhomlinov and Yanushkevich, Chief of the General Staff, seeks from Nicholas II a decree on a general mobilization. It is then suspended a few minutes before the boss of the mobilization department, General Dobrorolsky began to dictate a decree to telegraph operators capital Glavtelegraf. The reason was another dispatch to Nikolai from the Kaiser, who warned his cousin against a collapse. The

"nationally" "tuned" trio - the minister and two generals - on the morning of July 30 going again. "I

have accurate information that the German mobilization is in full swing," said Yanushkevich.

It wasn't true! The Germans announced mobilization only on 1 August. More precisely, on border with France, some mobilization activities began already in the last week of July, however, everything was calm on the Russian-German border. Count Ignatiev traveled through Germany on July 26, and here are his impressions: "In Eidkunen, the German border station, I met a familiar and ordinary environment, except perhaps only customs and the railroad employees seemed to me especially helpful. Naturally, all day I did not tear myself away from the window glass, trying to notice even the slightest, but signs of the pre-mobilization period, familiar to me since the academy: elongation landing platforms, concentrating to large stations of the rolling railway composition and the like. But it was already getting dark, and I still didn't manage to notice anything."

But Yanushkevich "noted" something, and he and Sukhomlinov got through to the tsar. Nikolai, after listening to Yanushkevich, was brief:

- I stop talking. - Your

Majesty, Sergey Dmitrievich conveys his most humble request

let me say a few words to you.

- Well ...

Sazonov picked up

the phone: - Your Majesty, I humbly ask for an audience for an urgent report.

Nikolay paused and agreed: - Come

at three o'clock.

MILITARY Minister Sukhomlinov March 12, 1914 in an "anonymous" article in "Birzhevykh Vedomosti" said: "Russia is ready." The

leader of the Kadet Party, Milyukov, believed that "this article was fatal" and became "one of the shocks that caused the war."

And these were still flowers ... May 31 (according to the European account, this is June 13, which gives, to word, an amusing symbolic inversion: "31-13") in the second inspired Sukhomlinov's article in Birzhevka stated even more abruptly: "Russia is ready, it must be France is ready. In

the same months, a government order (outfit) for rifles for our very large arms factory, Tula, was as follows: in January 1914 - five (five!)

pieces, in February - also five, in March - six, in April - five, in May - one (one!), in June - again one, in July - one training rifle. What, reader, do not believe? I

believe that I do not believe

it, because I myself believe in such a thing with difficulty. Alas, the source of this information is quite authoritative, this is our famous gunsmith, general (and tsarist and Soviet armies) Vladimir Grigorievich Fedorov, then a member of the armory Department of the Artillery Committee.

In his memoirs, Fedorov wrote later: "A few days before the announcement war, the largest factory produces one training rifle per month! This is how it was prepared War Department to an armed clash. Looking ahead, I'll say that

with the start of the war, Fedorov leaned right into ... Japan for acute necessary for the Russian army, at least the old Japanese Arisaka rifles.

At the end of July, Sukhomlinov again serenely confirmed "our complete readiness." And so, having "made himself" on the newspaper pages, he now looked into the eyes of Sazonov, who had finished his telephone conversation with the tsar, and was looking forward to what he would say ...

"At three o'clock I am in Peterhof," Sazonov reassured him and Yanushkevich. - And this is what ... If I can convince him, then I call you, General, - he turned to Yanushkevich, - and you immediately call Glavtelegraf. "Good,"

Yanushkevich agreed excitedly. - And then I'll leave home, break phone and in general you will not find me if the order to cancel everything comes again.

The general was ready to roll even to the girls in a fun house. Sazonov went to the tsar. A two hours later, at about five in the evening on July 30, he called Yanushkevich:

- Now you can break your phone ...

A year will pass. In the autumn of 1915, Yanushkevich would telegraph Sukhomlinov: "The 3rd and 8th armies have melted away ... The cadres are melting away, and the replacements who receive rifles on the day of the battle (!!! - S.K.) , vying to surrender ... There are no rifles, and 150 thousand people stand without guns. Hour from time is not easier. We expect manna from heaven from you. The main thing is whether it is possible to buy rifles "...

And the German heavy artillery, not lacking in shells, smashed without the unarmed masses of peasants were tired, who had not only no cartridges, but, as we see, and rifles themselves...

After almost two decades in Parisian exile, Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich writes: "Fifteen million peaceful Russian peasants were to leave the hearth in 1914, because Alexander II and Alexander III considered necessary to protect the Balkan Slavs from the claims of Austria. Opening remarks manifesto issued by the king on the day of the declaration of war, testified to an obedient son (*that is, Nicholas II. - S.K.*), crucified on the cross of his own loyalty.

"Faithful to its historical traditions, our empire cannot be indifferent look at the fate of their Slavic brothers ... "It is difficult to achieve a greater pile illogicality throughout a short phrase. The most powerful empire ceases to be so at a time when sentimental fidelity to the traditions of the past deviates from the victorious march forward. The

reasons for Russia's entry into the war were explained, of course, not by the fact that Nikolai "crucified" himself "on the cross of his own loyalty" to the "precepts" of his father and grandfather ... But about the heap of illogicality in the tsar's manifesto, the august uncle of Nicholas wrote exactly: from the standpoint of the national interests of even tsarist Russia, the interweaving of Russia "in this conceived" not by Russia and "not in the least related to it" matter was absolutely illogical.

Alas, Russia was led to war in accordance with a different logic - the "golden" logic "dark" supranational forces, with the exchange "logic" of New Berdichev and New York ... And, as they later said in Russia with malicious irony: "England and France are ready to fight until the last Russian soldier..."

Chapter 6

The FIRST day of mobilization was scheduled for July 31. On this day, at 12:23 Vienna time, the Austrian-Hungarian War Ministry also received a decree on general mobilization against Russia, signed by Emperor Franz Joseph. Comparing the times and taking into account the difference in an hour, we can assume that Austria decided not at the same time, but *after* us, although later the opposite was also asserted. However, in the war with The Austrians have not joined Russia

yet. In the last pre-war days, it was not without a holder of the highest German orders Black and Red Eagle - Sergei Yulievich Witte. March 22,

1906 in a telegram to the Berlin banker Mendelssohn regarding of a possible German loan, Witte wrote about "the wise principles proclaimed in Björk"...

The principles in Björk were proclaimed, as we remember, and indeed not stupid, but Witte he himself torpedoed them.

Now he created for himself the image of an opponent of the conflict, but his recipe was by no means peacemaker: "We need to jump on this crazy impudent Wilhelm in time."

In what sense is it to "stick" and can the formidable tone of an unprepared (in the words of Witte) Russia to reason with a well-prepared Germany - this Sergey Yulievich is not explained.

And at midnight on July 31, the German ambassador Pourtales came to Sazonov once again. In the morning Nikolai himself took him, but what did Nikolai mean in Russia, if necessary help her, not hurt her? The conversation with the king came out empty, and now Pourtales stood before Sazonov. -

Mr. Minister, I am authorized by my government to convey to your government that if by twelve o'clock on the first of August Russia is not demobilized, then Germany will also announce mobilization.

Does this mean war? Sazonov asked. No, but we are extremely close to her.

Kaiser Wilhelm was impulsive, no doubt. In a third of a century in power, he developed a completely individual style: effective realism in details and energetic illusions in the general *vision* of things. Germany of his youth was only Junker Prussia, and Germany of its late maturity - a mighty industrial Reich, whose possessions stretched to the equator. And now Wilhelm was inclined to believe that Europe must reckon with him more than with itself, because he was sure that he was better Europe knows how to ensure the good not only of Germany, but of the entire continent... cheeky?

Overconfident to the point of narcissism? And this

is how to say ... Even before the war, pastor Nauman put forward the ideas of "Middle Europe" with the rule Germany. Such a program found its reinforcement in the views of no longer ministers. God, and the servants of Mammon - the industrialists and financiers of

Germany. Immediately after the outbreak of hostilities - September 9, 1914 - these plans, as the main goals of the war, Chancellor Bethmann-Hellweg stated in a special note. Germans it was supposed to create a Central European economic union consisting of Austria-Hungary, a weakened France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Poland, as well as Italy, Sweden, Norway under "actual German leadership." How could such ideas be evaluated from the point of view

of Russia's interests and prospects? "Middle Europe" did not threaten Russia if Russia was engaged in

solely by its internal growth, without opposing the creation of such a Europe, whether united by the sword, whether by economic means ... A powerful united economy

continental Europe would immediately split the Anglo-Saxon plans for world hegemony, but the same economy could help us in building a mighty Russian state if would foreign loans go to industrial development, not construction "strategic" roads through the Pinsk swamps.

But could "Middle Europe" be the result of a war? Basically yes, but only when Russia would not participate in this war. In a one-on-one war Germany would weaken France and become the sole leader of Europe. Well, God bless her ...

It is quite possible

to assume that Kaiser Wilhelm, Pastor Naumann, Chancellor Bethmann in theoretically they were not mistaken in their assessments of the chances of "Middle Europe" ... Another thing is that given the real political situation that was realized by 1914, their views were a dangerous dream. The idea of "Middle Europe" could become a reality, but only in alliance with Russia or with Russia's neutrality. And for such an opportunity, Wilhelm he waved his hand - New Berdichev himself had been pulling in the other direction for a long time. And this anti-German the maneuver was carried out by provocateurs so deftly that the course and meaning of events did not caught even by those who, by age, by position and rank, would not hurt to be and more transparent. So,

the famous General Brusilov at one time, even after the First World War, was I am sure that "the external and internal German was omnipotent with us ... In St. Petersburg there was powerful Russian-German party, demanding at all costs, at the cost of any whatever the humiliation of a strong alliance with Germany, which at that time defiantly spat on us. What, under such conditions, could be the preparation of the minds of the people for this obviously imminent war, which was supposed to decide the fate of Russia.

Here Brusilov is clearly denied logic ... If the "inner German" was so total "omnipotent", then why would this war with the "outside German" be "obviously inevitable"? And not was it more correct to assume the opposite (and, alas, true to reality): how once because those who were omnipotent turned out to be the Russian-German alliance was a bone in gluttonous throat, the war, absolutely unnecessary for Russia, became from a certain moment "imminent"? I

don't know how Germany "spit" on us, being our *largest* trading partner, who also supplied industrial equipment for the creation of the latest industries ... But I know that the Anglo-French did not spit on Russia. Yes, they kissed her, in the same "attack of passions" that the notorious Judas once experienced Iscariot, kissing Jesus Christ... By the

way, once again about Brusilov... Analyst Valentin Nikolaev reports that general, who was in the 20s at the Revolutionary Military Council of the USSR for especially important assignments, in one of of his lectures named the main permanent strategic continental opponents Russia: England, Turkey, Poland ... The audience was surprised: what about Germany, in the war with which Brusilov, the author of the "Brusilov breakthrough", so distinguished himself?

"We had nothing to share with her," the general, who had begun to see clearly, replied, " *we were just pitted* ... "Well,

what can I say, reader? Perhaps

one thing: "OH!!!" ...

IMMORTAL gods can treat those who betray them calmly. They have in reserve eternity.

What about

people? What

about the peoples? There are critical moments for mortals when they either break the chain disastrous circumstances, or are entangled by them even more tightly ...

Not the interests of the "German-Russian party", but the interests of the Russian state dictated one solution: to abandon the conflict with the Germans. And, sadly, intuitively

this was understood (and therefore hesitated) even by such a weak monarch as Nicholas II.

And how could he not doubt the correctness of his anti-German choice, if in February 1914, a note from Pyotr Nikolaevich Durnovo, the most prominent figure in the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Empire, lay on the emperor's desk. In 1884-93 - Director of the Police Department, in 1900-1905 - Deputy Minister, from September 1905 to April 1906 - Minister of the Interior, Durnovo was then completely from the ministry dismissed not without Witte's intrigues. Since 1906, Pyotr Nikolayevich became a member State Council. Durnovo was

the leader and banner of the extreme right. Lenin called it "wild dog" and over and over again used the formula "Dubasov and Durnovo" ... Adjutant General Dubasov - the Moscow governor in 1905-1906 - bloodily suppressed the Moscow The December uprising, and Durnovo did the same throughout Russia.

Yes, the class image of Durnovo is quite clear, he was a monarchist and a defender of the interests exclusively of the ruling classes. He was so consistently and organically oligarchic that even the oligarchy recoiled from him. But a note to Tsar Durnovo wrote an interesting and smart from every point of view of it, and therefore I will quote it extensively ...

"The vital interests of Russia and Germany," wrote Durnovo, "do not collide anywhere and give full grounds for the peaceful coexistence of these two states. Future of Germany - on the seas, that is, exactly where Russia has, essentially the most continental of all great powers, there are no interests."

Well, isn't that the case to this day? Only cretins from geopolitics and notorious corrupt officials can throw people's money into the French "Mistrals" and advocate for the "ocean fleet", giving the most important regions to the actual possession of the United States and NATO continental Russian geopolitical space, starting with Ukraine!

I perfectly understood Durnovo and the senselessness of our struggle for the Black Sea straits that "release" the Russian fleet only into the Mediterranean Sea, locked Gibraltar and controlled by England (and now by America). Durnovo

wrote like this: "I will say more, the defeat of Germany is in the area of our barter is unprofitable for us." And

Durnovo did not limit himself to this simple statement, but described in detail the essence of mutual economic relations:

"As for German dominance in the field of our economic life ... Russia too poor in capital and industrial enterprise to be able to get by without a large influx of foreign capital. Therefore, the well-known dependence on whether other foreign capital is inevitable for us as long as the industrial the entrepreneurial spirit and material resources of the Russian population will not develop to such an extent that they will make it possible to completely refuse the services of foreign entrepreneurs ... But as long as we need them, German capital is more profitable for us than any other. First of all, this capital is the cheapest of all, being content with the least percentage of entrepreneurial profits ... Moreover, a significant proportion of the profits received on German capital invested in Russian industry, and completely from us does not leave: unlike the British and French capitalists, the German capitalists and move to Russia with their own capital. The English and French are sitting at their border, to the last penny choosing from Russia produced by their enterprises profits. On the contrary, German entrepreneurs live in Russia for a long time and quickly turn brown. Who has not seen, for example, the French and the British, who have lived almost all their lives in Russia and not a word of Russian speaking. On the contrary, how many Germans can be seen in Russia who, even with an accent, broken language, but still would not explain themselves in Russian?

There is something to think about for the living generations of "dear Russians" who are diligently listening to the Anglo-Saxons ...

As for the economic aspects of the conflict with the Germans, Durnovo thought just like a Marxist:

"The consequence of this war will be such an economic situation, before which the oppression of German capital will seem easy. After all, there is no doubt that the war would require spending far in excess of Russia's limited financial resources. We will have to turn to the credit of the allied and neutral states, and it will be provided, of course, not for nothing ... And inevitably, even after the victorious end of the war, we will fall into such financial and economic bondage to our creditors, in comparison with which the present dependence on German capital will seem like an ideal.

How Pyotr Nikolaevich looked into the water

here! Surprisingly, the growing anti-German sentiment in the "educated" metropolitan In circles, even Soviet historians explained that the growing Russian commercial and industrial capital was beginning to be hindered by German competition. They say that industrialists especially wanted to break the Russian-German treaty of 1904, since this de import to Russia of "German manufactures".

But "manufactured product" is different for "manufactured product". From Germany to Russia came the vast majority part of the export under the item "machinery and parts of machines". It's one thing to put a "competitor" with a bed welded from a rolled "corner", another thing is to put a "corner" and absolutely another thing is to set up a rolling mill, on which this "corner" is rolled. The Germans supplied us beds and rental, but they also supplied rolling mills. So German supplies threatened not so much to the internal marketing of Russian goods, but to plans for technological enslavement of Russia by Anglo-Saxon and French Capital.

Industrialists Ryabushinsky rolled up "Slavic" dinners in the spring of 1913 in companies with "Slavophilizing" cadet leaders under approving glances uncle of the tsar, Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolaevich ... Well, they shouted there about the "straits", but drinking and walking, in fact, for the glory of France, England,

Belgium ... Durnovo warned against this.

What is sad - with all the deadly accuracy for the figures of New Berdichev and the Entente analysis, Durnovo was not a special genius-prophet. He wrote about the obvious.

But how many were found among the Russian elite of those who were capable of this to see the obvious and even more so to be guided by it? Brusilov seemed pro-German omnipotence... However, what kind of omnipotence could we talk about if the situation was not broken even documents and arguments like those presented by Durnovo? Nikolai

did not draw practical conclusions from Durnovo's warning, but doubted ... Yes, and how could he not doubt if he had to decide on a very a lot ... A couple of years ago, Nikolai, faced with the need to replace position of our ambassador in Berlin, offered him to the then Chairman of the Council Ministers to Count V. N. Kokovtsov, saying this: - You know

that this post is very difficult, our policy has always been based on friendship with Germany, and now the circumstances are such that we need an experienced and seasoned, like you, to protect our interests. Kokovtsov

listened attentively, not even trying to express his reaction with a gesture, and the king continued:

"Besides, Emperor Wilhelm apparently sincerely favors you and squandered me the greatest praises to you.

"Sir, I am touched by your confidence, but can I give a completely frank answer, or is your decision final? asked Kokovtsov. - No, I do not want to embarrass you, Vladimir Nikolaevich, and I make this offer, because I believe in him.

- Your Majesty, I do not have the right to refuse the post of ambassador in Berlin, but I am afraid to be in Berlin in the wrong place ... I'm not used to diplomatic subtleties, but in Berlin every word counts. Nikolai

listened without visible displeasure, and Kokovtsov made up his mind:

"And, frankly, I also fear that my belief in keeping the peace, no matter what. can now meet other tendencies in those circles of ours that are so persecuted called "national" policy...

The word "national" Kokovtsov pronounced emphatically, clearly putting it in quotation marks, but Nikolai did not want to pay attention to this, did not ask for clarification and said listlessly:

"I cannot rape you, and I will gladly keep your current position. Tell Sazonov that he can send me a report on his appointment candidate.

Who chose the candidate there - whether Sazonov or *not* Sazonov, but the choice fell, as we know, on S. N. Sverbeev, a man, according to Kokovtsov, "strikingly insignificant." And he turned out to be an ideal transmitter of the ideas of both his "boss" Sazonov and behind-the-scenes chefs "chef".

In this fully documentary episode, taken from the memoirs of Kokovtsov, as in a drop of dirty water reveals a full set of "bacilli" that poisoned the Russian state "organism": lethargy and indecision of the king; the inability of *the truly* nationally minded part of his entourage to reverse this lethargy and active fuss of supposedly national "New Berd" forces, directed by the "Anglo-French" Entente, which, in turn, was directed by America.

HOWEVER, even on the eve of the 1914 Collapse Nikolai had doubts. Kaiser, at all his self-confidence, he also hesitated. Upon learning that the Serbian Prime Minister Pasic *almost* agreed with Vienna's ultimatum, he wrote to Secretary of State von Jagow that Austria-Hungary should confine itself to diplomatic success and not start a war.

Milyukov later claimed that Wilhelm was "carried away by the idea of a war with Russia", but I forgot that at that time he himself was publicly "carried away" by the idea of a war with Germany.

The Kaiser, on the other hand, was thinking ... It was much easier for him to mobilize than for Nikolai. Colonel General Helmut von Moltke Jr. once mentioned that the German army was in state of "permanent mobilization", but behind this was not a readiness for aggression, but thoughtfulness, organization, well-developed road network and extremely high military the quality of the reserve, even more combat-ready than young conscripts.

After the announcement of mobilization, it was difficult for Russia to start it and not easy stop. They pressed on the "technical impossibility" of demobilization in St. Petersburg, but, in fact, it was not so difficult, and it was our mobilization - if desired - to curtail even after it started. After all, by noon on August 1, announced on the morning of July 31 mobilization has not yet left the stage of mastering mobilization instructions officials and their receipt of mobilization sums. It was possible to suspend the

reserve camps that had not yet begun, but not for dignitary New Berdichev. Then

- after the war - there was a lot of controversy about whether it was possible to avoid war, not whether Berlin hastened with the latest ultimatum. The German socialists argued Bernstein and Kautsky, went over the variants of our Tarle and the German Delbrück, but the meaning had only the fact that the war was not decided in Berlin and not in St. Petersburg. Sarajevo shots were only fired by the Serbs, but they prepared the ground for them yes-a-a-leko not

They.

The war was decided, and the Russian colossus was spun up not at all in order to last moment to stop it...

At seven in the evening, Count Pourtales again entered Sazonov's office. It was clear that the ambassador Germany is very worried. Right

from the threshold, he asked the

question: - Is the Russian government ready to give a favorable answer to the ultimatum Germany?

- No, we cannot cancel the general mobilization, but we are still disposed to negotiations to resolve the dispute peacefully ... - Mr. Minister,

I again ask if the Russian government is ready to give a favorable response to the German ultimatum? I would like to point out the grave consequences that your refusal to reckon with this German demand will entail ...

- No, Mr. Ambassador, the mobilization cannot be stopped.

Pourtales took a folded sheet of paper out of his pocket and said in a trembling voice: "So, I'm asking for the third time, Mr. Minister: is the Russian government ready to give a favorable response to Germany's ultimatum? "Alas,

Count, I can't give you any other answer than what you have already heard... Now Pourtales was shaking both in his voice and in his hand with the paper, but he finished: "In that case, I have been instructed by my government to convey the following note to you. The note contained a declaration of war and - due to a phenomenal oversight of the German embassies - even in two versions that Chancellor Bethmann-Hellweg sent from Berlin.

However, then even Sazonov did not pay attention to this. The meaning was clear, and literally Sergei Dmitrievich did not read the note. And Pourtales went up to the window, leaned back, looking at Petersburg from the office of the Russian minister for the last time, raised his hands with an exclamation: "Who I could have foreseen that I would have to leave Petersburg under such conditions! - And... cried.

Sazonov, too, suddenly looked into the future and ... also trembled. He approached Pourtales and Instead of a cold handshake, he unexpectedly embraced him. And then Pourtales, already an ex-ambassador, with unsteady steps left Sazonov's office ... Above is a description

of Sazonov himself ... The same scene is very picturesque, but with a very large share of gag, seriously distorting the information of the same Sazonov, was described by Valentin Savich Pikul in his "Unclean Power". Well, the liveliness of the imagination of writers is not forbidden. Worse is that Pikul elementary distorted the dates, arguing that by the time of the last conversation between Pourtales and Sazonov "the Germans have already occupied defenseless Luxembourg." They are his occupied, but only the next day, August 2nd.

Alas, this is not the only deliberate "delusion" of Valentin Savich, exposing the situation in a light that is beneficial for his schemes, but unfavorable for viewing.

facts of history. And, in order to put an end to it, I will inform you that Pikul is all the "artistic details" missing from Sazonov, which make it possible to accuse Germany of stubborn intention to fight, he simply copied from ... the French ambassador Maurice Palaiologos. A this peculiar diplomat was inferior to his great compatriot Dumas only in literary talent, but by no means in the talent for fiction.

Tsar Nicholas modestly noted that day: "I took a walk with the children. At 6½ we went to all-night service. Upon returning from there, we learned that Germany had declared war on us. We dined ... In the evening, the English ambassador Buchanan (*Buchanan*. - S.K.) arrived with a telegram from George (*George V.* - S.K.). It took me a long time to write an answer with him... We drank tea at 12¼."

Very little time will pass, and the first Russian blood will flow abundantly. City Moscow - through the son of the Moscow industrialist Vladimir von Meck - will ask Leonid Osipovich Pasternak (father of the poet) to draw a poster "for a charity collection of donations in favor of the victims of the war.

Pasternak - a subtle and impressionable artist - will catch the "nerve" of what is happening accurately, even prophetically, and in a few colors will perform an expressive lithographed poster: a wounded soldier in a cap presses a white bandage to his forehead, leaned against the wall and is about to fall.

Crowds stood in front of the poster posted in Moscow on the day of the collection. The grandmothers were crying. A then an aide-de-camp came from St. Petersburg and informed the author: "The Sovereign with your poster dissatisfied. He said that it was his, - here the handsome secular man raised his voice to an impossible courage, - *his* soldier always keeps himself well done, and not like that "...

And really! Why,
one wonders, and not soar like a falcon to the bleeding "lower
rank," if his sovereign began his entry in his diary about the first day of the war with the words: "A good
day, especially in terms of raising spirits"? After that, the Russian
troops were naturally supposed to look to the devil and under the marches
regimental bands cheerfully go towards the German machine-gun "showers" ...
"Showers", cutting off the past from Russia and hiding behind its dense lead
veil the future of Russia.
Still unclear...

PRE-WAR week is over. For Russia and Germany, the first military
a week. And already fought, but so far only with each other, Austria-Hungary and Serbia.

By this time, Germany - in fulfillment of the ideas of the late Schlieffen - had found
a way to declare war on France on August 3 in the evening and entered Belgium on the morning of August 4.

Paris began a general mobilization on July 31, having learned that Petersburg had announced it.
However, the French attributed the beginning of their mobilization to August 1 - the day when they
Germany announced. Poincaré and Joffre were worried about "national considerations
moral order" and wanted the responsibility to be later placed on
Germans.

At the moment of the beginning of the tragedy of the peoples, these buffoons cared only about the purity of their
shirt-fronts and general gloves. But even before the start of hostilities, they still turned out to be
drenched in the blood of a better man. July 31 in Paris, during a speech against
unleashing the war, the famous socialist leader Jean Jaurès was killed.

This was the true mood of mass bourgeois France, which placed
responsibility for the war on the Kaiser.

However, French politicians - lovers of poses and phrases - could not do without
hypocrisy even in conversations with each other. On August 1, Minister of War Messimi called
to the mayor of Lyon, Edouard Herriot: "From now on, it is the struggle of civilization against barbarism. All
the French must be united in their hatred of the enemy, who has only one goal - to destroy the nation (*how
enough!* - S.K.), acting in the face of the whole world as
fighter for law and freedom.

Colonial "French" Indochina, Algeria, Somalia, Tunisia and Congo, Madagascar, Martinique and
Tahiti could only keep silent during these speeches. The Moroccans, however, were involved in the
struggle "for freedom", and they had to bleed on
fields near the

Marne. In the light of lamentations about "civilization and barbarism," the description by the former
French Ambassador in Berlin Jules Cambon on his last meeting with Secretary of State von Jagov. After
the declaration of war,

Jagov came to Cambon himself to say goodbye. Before
the German crowd roared and whistled with the French embassy, and Jagov looked slyly at
Frenchman and

remarked: - What would these fools say, *my dear friend*, if they saw how you and I
talking while sitting on the couch...

England soon joined the war. Moreover, "pacifist" and "neutral" England started the war with the
Reich first - on August 4th. Vienna declared war on

Russia only on 6 (sixth, reader!) August. So, it turned out that Austria-
Hungary, in anticipation of the war with which Russia began
full mobilization, entered the "Russian" main line of war last.

However, is it otherwise, the Great War (or the Great Massacre, or the Great Dressing
Superprofits - who cares) began in its entirety. For a long time
and seriously.

Already after the end of the war, some people claimed that there was supposedly a moment when the position England could turn Germany exclusively to Russia. and Anglo-Saxon historians are enthusiastically sucking on the question: "What would happen if the Germans in 1914 began massive offensive in the east, limited to defense in the west?"

It is not enough for the falsifiers of history that they were really quarreled and really divorced on opposite sides of the historical ring, two great peoples, called one complement the other. At least in assumptions, falsifiers and provocateurs want see *only* our mutual destruction, only *our* mutual weakening, without clashes between the Germans and the

"Europes" ... Later, fear of a potential German-Russian alliance and hatred for such in the future, they will break through not in the anti-Russian, but in the anti-Soviet policy of the West, in cannibalistic wishes of the American Truman and the Englishman Churchill son that Russians and Germans mutually destroyed each other as much as possible and for as long as possible ...

August 4, 1914 German Emperor Wilhelm II delivered a speech from the throne in the Reichstag: "The present situation is a consequence of the ill will nourished in for many years to the power and prosperity of the German Empire. We were forced defend ourselves, and we take up the sword with a clear conscience and unstained hands."

The first phrase in the Kaiser's speech was completely true, while the second was only partly true. None of those who had power in the world by birth, elections, money or his own dexterity, about a *clear* conscience could not even stutter, and Wilhelm as well.

Only those who stood on the side of Labor and only Labor, that is, Lenin and the Russians the Bolsheviks, who immediately opposed the war, and a few like Karl Liebknecht or Jean Jaurès had a clear conscience before the court of true (that is, not sleek) history. And yet, Germany was then,

perhaps, really a considerable share of the rightness. No wonder the Nobel laureate, Norwegian writer and politician Bjornstjerne Bjornson, who was called the "Norwegian Voltaire" and "Norwegian Hugo", wrote about the Germans a few years before the war:

"This is a great people, happy with their unshakable faith in the indisputability of their rights."

An outstanding personality, Bjornson knew what patriotism and national law are. Tem no less loyally did he reflect on "Germanic" Europe. Could it be assumed servile motives in a man who fought all his life for the independence of Norway from Sweden and for the democratization of society, was the author of the words of the national Norwegian anthem?

Let me give you one more opinion, although two-faced, but undoubtedly smart Karl Radek: "When Wilhelm II realized that to localize the war (*limiting himself to the conflict of Austria and Serbia. - S.K.)* will not succeed, he tried to make a counterpair in Vienna, but it was too late. Radek believed that Wilhelm only wanted to scare the tsar and thereby deprive the Serbs of Russian support.

Even more valuable can be considered the recognition of the American Barbara Tuckman, who wrote about Wilhelm like this: "When Russia began to mobilize, he (*Kaiser. - S.K.)* burst into a hot tirade with ominous predictions, attacking not the "traitors of the Slavs", but his cunning uncle (*that is, King Edward VII of England. - S.K.)*".

Yes, in the margins of the "hot" diplomatic telegrams, Wilhelm scribbled angrily: "Peace the most terrible of wars will overwhelm, the result of which will be the defeat of Germany. Environment Germany has finally become a fait accompli. We put our head in a noose... Dead Eduard is stronger than me alive "...

Monarch Wilhelm, who had long identified himself with the Reich, could not but attach the dominant value of the personality of another monarch, and therefore the role of Edward he exaggerated. But Wilhelm managed to see the presence of a conspiracy against Germany. AND it is significant that he blamed this conspiracy not on the Russians, but on the European Entente.

Even academician Tarle noted that in July 1914, the Kaiser was very incited by extremely the right-wing press of Germany, reproaching it with excessive peacefulness, compliance, and indecision. And who knows to what extent such "ultrapatriotic" appeals were paid for in dollars and pounds?

Wilhelm clearly expressed his attitude to the already ongoing war in the East with the answer to a secret request-memorandum of the commander of the German troops, General Falkenhayn in 1915. Falkenhayn asked whether negotiations with Russia on reconciliation? The Kaiser immediately responded with an unqualified

"Yes!" Germany was always deployed to the West, but at first the Germans did not advancing. Petersburg-Berdichev himself gave the order to cross the border and hastily the invasion of East Prussia solely in the interests of supporting the French.

Of course, Germany has been preparing for war for years, like the rest of its future participants. AND yet only about Germany can be said that in many ways it was a victim of circumstances not formed by her. Serbia

has become a victim of a provocation.

And

Russia? Russia fell victim to mediocre leadership and internal betrayal of her interests of the top, "cream of society".

It is always useful to know the opinion of a thoughtful military theorist, especially when it comes to such a figure as Marshal Shaposhnikov, who knew the First World War both as a soldier and realized it as a military thinker. Here is his assessment of the beginning of the war: "Mobilization for the threshold of the world war was its actual declaration, and only in this sense and could be understood ... If we consider the responsibility for the war from this point of view, then, of course, those who blame Russia for the world fire are right. Unpatriotic talk? No, just incomplete, because

further Shaposhnikov said directly:

"Of course, not

Russian mobilization was the cause of the European war" - and referred to Lenin, well who spoke about the beginning of the war during the war. Moreover, Shaposhnikov did not quote Lenin only because in the 1920s he was already the commander of the Red Army, but also because Lenin beat that is called, "to the point", stating: "War is a continuation of politics. Need to study politics before the war, politics that led and led to war ... Everyman

is limited to the fact that "the enemy is attacking", without understanding why the war is being waged, by what classes, for what political goal ... It is important why this war is being waged. Shaposhnikov gave

both a figurative and at the same time professionally accurate outline war: "The Germans from the banks of the Spree have the honor of establishing the term "oncoming battle". So, in accordance with its nature, we would sum up the world war under the rubric oncoming war. Perhaps bourgeois diplomats, political figures and historians in determining the nature of the war, and by the way, they will be divided in half responsibility for the war. Well

said, but still, perhaps, someone needs to give "big half"? After all, Shaposhnikov himself wrote that "the hand of the Serbian General Staff directed Princip's revolver, thereby challenging Austria-Hungary to a bloody struggle"...

And who directed the Serbian General

Staff? No, the role of Germany on the eve of the war was ambiguous, the role of Austria from the very the beginning was subordinate.

And the real direct instigators of the war turned out to be France and England, obedient to the Golden International. Therefore, it remains for us to throw the last a pre-war look at England and its Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey. It was he, and not Prime Minister Asquith, who completed the last "blows of the master's brush"

long conceived not by him alone and not by him in the first place.

It looked like this...

ON THE EVE of the delivery of the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, Gray rejected the offer Sazonov about the collective influence of Russia, England and France on Vienna. Britt needs was that the ultimatum was presented. Its content was not a secret for the British: in addition to the advance information of the Austrian ambassador, the main provisions ultimatums were presented on July 22 in The Times, controlled by Jewish circles since Disraeli-Beaconsfield. That is,

The Times was also informed the day before ...

On the "ultimatum day", July 23, Gray received the Austrian ambassador Mensdorff and became talk about the damage that the war will cause to the trade of the four great powers: Russia, Austria, France and Germany. He did not mention England, what the Austrian made of favorable conclusion: England will not fight. About Gray, Mensdorff reported: "He was cold-blooded and objective, as usual, friendly and not without sympathy for us. Less than a half-month remained before England entered the war ... All the next week Gray, whom Sazonov certified even in the twenties "a staunch pacifist", tirelessly engaged in one thing - the direction of Europe to war. The day after the delivery of the ultimatum, July 24, he spends in tireless work.

Already himself, personally, he informs the Russian ambassador Benckendorff that he is ready through the mediation of "disinterested" powers (England, France, Germany and Italy) to discuss the crisis with Austria-Hungary and Serbia.

Grey's Russia remained outside the brackets, but Sazonov was either naive or obscuring truth, and this hypocritical step of Gray was later highly appreciated (they say, Gray finally "agreed" with his proposal).

Gray, however, wrinkled at the same time such a barely perceptible - not sour, but only with gentlemanly *sourness* - a mine that Benckendorff reported to St. Petersburg the next day: "I don't observed not a single symptom either from Grey's side or from the King's pointing to that England is seriously considering the possibility of remaining neutral. My observations lead to a certain impression of the reverse order. Still, the Russian

German Benckendorff was not stupid! Then Gray again accepted Mensdorff. Yesterday he refused to discuss the Austrian note in essence, stating that he supposedly needs to see the document with his own eyes. Now the Austrian has brought official copy. - Sir, here

is the authentic text. Gray began to "thoroughly" read the already well-known text without any emotions on a perfectly shaved face. Then he put down the paper and sighed:

"You gave the Serbs too little time and were too categorical. But document - amazing, amazing ... - What do you

mean, sir? "Ah, Mr. Ambassador, I mean that England, fortunately, is here only impartial observer.

And finally, on the 24th, it is the turn of the German Ambassador in London, von Lichnowsky. Here Gray was simply categorical:

- As long as we are talking about localizing a clash between you and the Serbs, it's not me concerns...

"I understand, sir," Lichnowski agreed. "But if public opinion in Russia compelled the Russian government to act against Austria, the danger of a European war, in our opinion, will close," Gray led on. -

European? Lichnowski shivered involuntarily. - Yes ...

And all the consequences of such a war of *four*, - Gray slightly, but distinctly raised his quiet, measured voice - the great powers are completely unforeseeable.

Lichnowski almost asked: "And England?", But even so everything was clear. The four powers are Russia, Austria-Hungary, Germany and France... "So, England, thank God, puts itself out of the conflict," he thought to himself with relief. Lichnowsky.

A day later, on July 26, the British "team" of the Golden International went with royal trump. George V had an intimate conversation with his nephew, the Kaiser's brother Prince Henry of Prussia. The king spoke as if he were talking to his subject Sir Gray read from one page: de war should be localized between Austria and Serbia, and England will be neutral.

Heinrich, deceived by Georg (deceived, after all, what is there!) conveyed to his brother in Berlin that these words were clearly "said in

earnest." However, something else was being said. On July 27, at a cabinet meeting, Gray issued an ultimatum demanded the participation of England in the war and threatened to resign otherwise. But it was already simply coquetry: no one was going to *seriously* object, although *for the sake of appearance* the office and broken...

Winston Churchill, with his characteristic expressiveness, very precisely demonstrated the innate duplicity and hypocrisy of exemplary English gentleman: he informed his wife that vigorous military preparations had for him "*disgusting allure*". The first word was

an attempt at self-justification, the second... The second contained the truth. The July maneuvers of the Royal Navy showed the power of England very clearly: in order for the combined fleets to sail past the yacht of George V on inspection review, it took six hours! And on the night of

July 29, without a parade pomp, with the lights extinguished, the British dreadnoughts left Portland, passed the English Channel, the French English Channel, and headed to the military base in Scapa Flow. Now

the pre-war finale was approaching for Britain too ... What was it like? In all

writings on the First World War, the meeting of the British Cabinet on July 27, where Gray threatened to resign, looks like a Shakespearean story. After the report by Gray, who allegedly for the first time drew the attention of colleagues to the fact that the continent was about to war, silence reigned. Then it

was broken by Lord Morley, who in 1914 was seventy-six years (he died in 1923). It was an English liberal of the old school. He wrote biographies of Voltaire, Rousseau, Cromwell and his own patron - Gladstone ...

Wrote Morley and a two-volume Life of Cobden. Manufacturer Richard Cobden - a staunch supporter of free trade (free trade) - was a kind of politician in the middle of the 19th century. He opposed the Crimean War, against possession of Gibraltar, the sea dominion of England considered usurpation, and domination over India - adventure ... As a first step towards international disarmament, Cobden demanded a unilateral reduction of the British army and navy. Morley

himself, being Secretary of State for Indian Affairs, did not divided and repressed the Indian liberation movement brutally. But what does he have, like Cobden, could not be taken away, because it was love for England as a state of the British, and not branch office of Uncle Sam and the Rothschilds.

Morley was listed as pro-German, but he was just a pro-British who understood that good relations with the Germans were in the interests of the British.

This Lord Morley spoke out against the war with the Reich. He was supported by ten more cabinet members. Lloyd George and several ministers allegedly hesitated. With Gray there were only Prime Ministers Asquith, Holden and Churchill.

Embarrassment?

Historical moment? No,
reader, it's a play. Although
without the public - in front of each other. A

couple of years ago, during the Agadir crisis, in the same office of Asquith
the ratio was reversed: three people turned out to be on the side of peace with Germany, including
the same Morley. And then suddenly such a metamorphosis! But even that crisis was fraught with
England by war.

Moreover, then it was precisely the tough public position of England towards Germany
restrained the development of the conflict and transferred it to a purely political phase.

This time, the threat to move against Germany would certainly provide the same
Effect. That is, without giving "carte blanche" to Gray on a tough public anti-German
position, the ministers who disagreed with him brought the European war closer, and did not put it off. If
England declared herself neutral at first, this would only delay her
speech in support of the Franco-Russian Entente. True, Morley demanded peace in general with
Germany.

For the majority in the liberal cabinet, "vacillation" and "pacifism" were games
gentlemen. Once again, this was involuntarily confirmed by Gray himself;
submitter. The development of events was clear to the point. Show your position openly
England had to when there would be no reverse move for Russia.

Something else was also clear. Germany, going to war, actually went against all of Europe (her
union with Austria-Hungary did not change the overall picture). Germany's success could be assured
only a quick and effective strike against France through Luxembourg and the "corner" of Belgium. So
that the violation of Belgium's neutrality by Germany in the event of war was a foregone conclusion, and
any more or less competent, not only military, but also
politician. They all understood this about themselves, except, perhaps, the Belgian King Albert.

Russian military agent in France, Colonel Lazarev, back in 1906, proposed a plan
actions of the French army against a possible German offensive along the left bank
Meuse, through Belgium. The French General Staff reacted dismissively to the idea, but it turned out
just as Lazarev predicted. True, for the French there was no prophet even in their own country, because the
possibility of a German offensive through Belgium was also taken into account in the rejected
them the plan of the Frenchman Michel.

Why did the French Republican General Staff act here like an admiral
Nelson, looking at what he did not want to see, putting a telescope to
gougued out eye? Is it because the British Imperial General Staff did the same?

HOW did the Belgian factor affect England? A simple glance at the map shows that
the possession of the Belgian coast seemed to immediately give Germany strategic
benefits: from Belgium to England across the sea at hand. But across the sea. And ruin the fleet in
attempts to land in England, the Kaiser, of course, would not.

Subsequently, Lloyd George threw a biting phrase that, they say, while it was a question of
Serbia, ninety-nine hundredths of the English people were against the war, and when it came to
about Belgium, ninety-nine hundredths of the English people wished to fight.

The tongue of the noteworthy parliamentary "lion" was suspended properly, but is it worth
take this kind of talk seriously?

Firstly, any nation - by itself - is always and everywhere inclined in its mass towards peace, in
which is profoundly right. And, secondly, the passage of the Germans through Belgium to the security of England, according to
essence, did not threaten.

But as a formal reason for England's entry into the war, it was good. Sir Edward
calmly waited for the inevitable course of events, while daily
"persuading" the stubborn de "pacifists" and Prince Lichnowski. But on July 29, during the second
already on that day of meeting with the German ambassador, Gray finally stated that "British
the government wishes to maintain its former friendship with Germany" only as long as

the latter does not touch France.

Here you are, grandmother, and St.

George's Day! Note that by the time Gray spoke with Lichnowsky in St. Petersburg, the day was over - the difference in time had an effect. Gray had fresh news from Buchanan and knew that Russia in fact, it is already mobilizing and its conflict with Germany is a foregone conclusion. That's why he's so sharp and changed his tone, declaring that England would side with

France. Lichnowski could only ask in astonishment,

"So how?" "If you get involved in a conflict with France, we will be forced to take urgent decisions and we can't stay away.

As we see, Sir Edward, in whose "statehood wisdom, inner honesty and nobility" was downright in love with the Russian cadet Milyukov, resistance "pacifists" inside the British Cabinet did not consider it a hindrance and bent his line to the fullest. confidence that everything will be as it should be for those who need it ...

Shocked, Lichnowski repulsed an emergency dispatch to Berlin. Wilhelm, after reading it, reacted surprisingly shrewdly, writing on the ambassador's London telegram: "England opens her cards at the moment when she considered that we were driven into a dead end and were in hopeless situation! Low merchant bastard, tried to deceive us with dinners and speeches. The words of the king addressed to me in a conversation with Heinrich are a gross deceit. Gray certainly knows that all he has to do is utter one serious warning. word in Paris and Petersburg and recommend neutrality to them, and both will immediately fall silent. But he is wary of saying that word and instead threatens us. You nasty son of a bitch!" This was written even before Pourtales' St. Petersburg ultimatum, so even two days before the first declaration of hostilities, the Kaiser was indeed inclined not to start a war, like Nikolai (he personally) in St. Petersburg.

August 1, 1917 has not yet become a landmark day between peace and war. But to break the last threads of peace between Berlin and St. Petersburg was necessary for many in Paris, London, but especially overseas. Already cobweb, Russian-German ties still held the European peace, now unnecessary in Europe to anyone except its peoples. Moreover, perhaps, the Russian state and the German Reich ... On August 1, the thinned threads burst. France was able to say that she goes to war because of allied Russia, which Germany declared war on ...

Germany, on the other hand, went ahead to France, while hooking Belgium. *Reason* for England arose...

At the morning meeting of the cabinet on August 4, Sir Gray only had to shrug his shoulders: they say, circumstances dictate ... And the cabinet has already unanimously voted for the war. Two were consistent to the end: Lord Morley and the only Labor Minister John Burns. They have resigned.

Although later, in 1927, after the death of the lord, his "Memorandum on Morley retired. It became clear from him that Morley left more because of not interfering his pacifist past to the military cabinet. Revealed from the posthumous memorandum and more: how poorly they were aware of the contacts of the General Staffs Entente even British ministers, if they received only official information.

On the same day, Gray made a speech in the House of

Commons: - European peace cannot be saved, because some countries sought to war. France entered the war on a duty of honor. We are indebted to no one but God and our own principles. We are free to choose our course. However the French coast is defenseless. Belgium's neutrality is about to be trampled on. Can we we stand quietly on the sidelines and observe the commission of the most heinous crime, forever staining the pages of history with shame, and thus turn into partner in sin?

Gray spoke slowly, pompously and falsely, but the main motive is still involuntarily said: "England must oppose the excessive expansion of any powers."

That was the point. In the evening, Gray sent a letter to the German embassy to Prince Lichnowski: "His Majesty's Government considers that between the two countries from 11 day (i.e. August 4) there is a state of war."

AMERICAN Barbara Tuckman wrote in her "Guns of August" without a trace of irony: "The minutes when an individual manages to lead a nation are remembered forever, and Gray's speech became one of the turning points on which people subsequently counting down the course of history. Considering that the British government was only visibly spurred on by all sides: Austin Chamberlain, Balfour, conservative opposition, the words of Tuckman look like a mockery of the tragedy of millions of people whose lives, given over the years war, were supposed to bring millions of dollars to the elite of a country far from Europe - Tackman's homeland."

Tuckman was also sure, for example, that Lord Kitchener on August 4 was almost removed from the steamer bound for Egypt to be hastily appointed Minister of War. Here, they say, to what extent the war was a forced impromptu for England. In fairy tales, of course, this happens, but only there ... How much does a first-class cabin cost from London to Alexandria? Gold

The International has been spent more than once on more expensive theatrical props, and the performance with the "departure" of Kitchener (personally, perhaps, in this farce and not dedicated) was clearly designed for a place in future "scientific" monographs. Well, can it be more expressive to show that Lady Britain only succumbed to circumstances, that she was "forced by the Teutons, who violated the neutrality of unfortunate Belgium"? Even the Minister of War had to to search hastily, in a hurry ... Well, it was

one of those "impromptu" that succeed so well because carefully *prepared* However, .

not far from Tuckman, the Soviet "History of the First World War" also left, making a "profound" conclusion: "The British government could prevent the start war in 1914, if it had unequivocally declared its position ... ", etc.

That's how it is ... But how could the British government prevent starting a war if the true rulers of Britain did everything to prevent Europe from starting war and stay within the world?! "History of

the First World War ...", however, placed on England "a significant part of the blame" for starting the war. And this is when, in fact, the English "part" was decisive, overwhelming (adding the blame of the United States).

Perhaps later generations of Soviet historians were influenced by Tarle schemes. Assessing the pre-war situation, Yevgeny Viktorovich went over, it seemed would, all the prevailing combinations of interests: Serbia, Austria, Russia, Germany, England and France, did not even forget about Italy. And

only about the interests of the United States, as the most important reason for the war, he did not mention during analysis of those days not a word.

Why, I can't say ... But Tarle repeatedly argued that both the Entente and the Austro the German bloc, but in the summer of 1914 it was beneficial to start it only for Germany.

I hope that I have said enough to draw the opposite conclusion ... Of course, especially Austria-Hungary was not averse to resolving its conflict with Serbia by force. But only with Serbia! Austria did not want to get involved in a war with Russia. But let's say Russia...

Although what does the Russia of Lomonosov, Suvorov and Ivan the Nameless Great have to do with it? Not Russia, and its "nationally minded" New Berdichev "elite" carefully took care of that at the right time a military fire flaring up in the right place is enough ideological "kerosene" to "extinguish" this fire. Here are

just three pre-war episodes ... December

27, 1912 ... Sazonov in St. Petersburg declares to the Serbian ambassador: "Serbs defeat Austria (*Wow!* - S. K.) and the future belongs to them. Moreover, Sazonov conveyed the Serb had a joint Franco-Russian opinion, and by the summer of 1914 it had not been disavowed. The French ambassador Maurice Palaiologos assured the head of the office of Baron Sazonov Schilling: "Russia and France have never been in a better position than now" ...

April 1913 ... The same Sazonov incites regular Serbian guests: "You Serbs must work for the future, since you will receive a lot from Austria lands."

And now February 1914 of the year ... Now Nicholas II himself is encouraging the Serbian Prime Minister Pasic: "We will do everything for Serbia."

You read this, and the question turns on your tongue: "What are you ready to do for Russia?" No, both Academician Tarle and many others turned out to have a "mirror" of analysis, alas, crooked. The real sins of Germany were incredibly prominent in him. The sins of the Entente cringed, looked small. And Uncle Sam's beard was generally lost. Germany in this "mirror" belligerently puffed out her cheeks, and the Entente goggled in fright. But it was not so in reality ... It is significant

that in some places the quite insightful Barbara Tuckman suddenly "naively" trusted the testimony of David Lloyd George, who later claimed that bankers and businessmen were horrified at the thought of war, and the governor of the Bank of England, visiting Sir David on Saturday, August 1st, informed him: "The City strongly opposes our entry into the war."

Of course, among the British financial and industrial elite there were also sensible people who understood that the war would likely weaken England and strengthen the United States. For now the credit system of the world had London as its center, but how it would be after the war, it remained just guess. And if no one saw a troubled future for Britain in Britain itself, then there would be no influential (*but not decisive*) forces advocating the Anglo-German friendship. However, if the business city were really "against" (and even "resolutely"), then there would be no war.

No, the City was running its part of the party in complete accord with Wall Street, and Wall Street was already wrote the score for the war.

As for Lloyd George, he's so deeply immersed in gun dealing. the world's largest arms dealer Sir Basil Zakharov, what is Sir David to war was ready at any moment, as was his behind-the-scenes omnipotent partner.

PERSONALITY of Basil Zakharov - a multimillionaire and financial businessman - in our virtually unknown in the country. In the West, he is also less popular than the Rothschilds and Rockefellers. It is not surprising: as the first wrote about him in 1933 (in the 2nd and 3rd there is not a single line about Zakharov!) The Great Soviet Encyclopedia, he "avoided publicity, preferred to work behind the scenes. Originally from Constantinople (father - Russian, mother - Greek), he, according to the authoritative testimony of the same first TSB, "reached riches in unknown ways. However, there is something that can be said about this...

So, for example, Jacques Bergier, the author of the most interesting monograph "Industrial espionage", reports that when the inventor of the machine gun Hiram Maxim arrived for demonstration of a sample machine gun at an artillery range in La Spezia with the Duke Genoese and a whole retinue of Italian specialists and generals, then the two gunners who were supposed to fire were lying on the ground dead drunk: they had drunk them in tavern agents of Zakharov, a competitor of Maxim ...

In Vienna, in a similar situation, the test shooters were put to sleep, and the machine gun spoiled.

Bergier writes that Zakharov developed "a very perfect system of bribes". For example, in Russia, Zakharov went to some influential official on Wednesday and told him: "Today we have Thursday." The official, of course, objected, and then Zakharov, insisting on his own, offered a bet for 10 thousand rubles. And ... "losing" ...

Zakharov ran both a large arms business and a huge organization of industrial espionage and sabotage, which he gave the name "ZZ Network". In during the war, this network worked for both blocks - money does not smell!

How wealthy Zakharov was is evident even from a few details of his *published* "track record": the supply of machine guns to Russia during the Russo-Japanese War; lending money to the English king Edward VII; leadership (together with another super-rich man Deterding) by the Anglo-Dutch oil company Royal Dutch Shell "...

There was Sir Basil (he was awarded a knighthood) and the actual owner of the English weapons company "Vickers". He did common business with the German "Krupp", the French "Schneider-Creso", the Austrian "Skoda" ...

He lived for a long time... Born in 1850, died in 1930. And in 1914 he was in relative youth: he was sixty-four. After the war, received "his" government (Zakharov was listed as a French subject) Order of the Honorary legion, from the English king - the Order of the Bath, and from Oxford University - the degree doctor of civil law, although he knew one right - the right of an armed rapist and gesheftmacher ...

He was indecently stingy and greedy.

For Zakharov, it didn't matter how it sounds: business, profit, profit, gesheft, profit, "fat" ... If only this fat was thicker ... He was a French subject, he ruled in English "Vickers", but one of the effective prototypes of German submarines became the Nordenfeld submarine, which Zakharov supplied to Greece and Turkey, and from there the drawings "somehow" ended up in

Germany ... However, was this Basil the only one

like that! The future lieutenant general of the Red Army, already mentioned more than once, and during World War I - Russian military agent in France, Count Ignatiev by the will of fate found himself at the forefront of activities related to Russian military orders. He left description of an interesting episode. Around Ignatiev (an honest man, later who gave the Soviet government two hundred and twenty-five million francs, which could pocket with the knowledge of the French government) envoys were spinning American industrial magnate Morgan. But the count understood: providing monopoly to Morgan is tantamount to surrendering himself to

him. Morgan's machinations disturbed, as it turned out, Marshal Kitchener as well. Kitchener summoned Ignatiev to London, and there the three of them negotiated with a Russian military agent in England, Lieutenant General Yermolov. The audience was over, the Russians were already on their way along the corridor, but suddenly a giant non-commissioned officer caught up with them and asked Ignatiev to return.

Ignatiev recalled: "Kitchener was standing in the middle of the office. He came close to me and, looking straight ahead, in a low voice, with great inner excitement, asked:

"Confirm, Colonel, that you are not in favor of an agreement with Morgan!" Ignatiev was just an honest soldier, not a tsarist minister or a New Berditch schemer. How could he guarantee the integrity of Russian

"top", corrupt almost without exception? Answering evasively, he asked: - Let me know why you might be so interested in this question? "Already red," Ignatiev

wrote, "the weathered face of the general turned crimson. He nervously took me by the button of my tunic and said through his teeth:

"If only because this is exactly what Lloyd George wants" ...

In fairness, I will give an example from a formally different camp ... On some samples of English shells were stamped "KR-96/04", the meaning of which was clarified only after the war: shells that were manufactured in England under license were marked this way German cannon "king" Krupp company "Vickers". After the armistice she paid Krupp a huge sum, so that he profited from the fact that he invented shells killed his own compatriots - German soldiers.

However, the armor of the English dreadnoughts was manufactured under the license of the same Krupp ... When in 1923 Krupp was involved in a provocation at his factories, he was arrested and sentenced by a French military tribunal to 15 years in prison, the largest French capitalists and industrialists, the Spanish king and even the Pope immediately defended Krupp, who was recognized as a war criminal, and after six months, the steel and cannon "king" was released from the Düsseldorf prison to freedom ...

Then he financed and armed Hitler.

KRUPP - Vickers ... Lloyd George - Morgan ... Lloyd George - Zakharov ... Morgan - Rothschild ... Rothschild - Rosebery ... Rosebery - Churchill ... These were only separate links of one common chain into which the ongoing war wove also 4 million tons (!) of barbed wire that entangled the battlefields ...

The chain hung heavier and heavier on humanity, fettered it ... And instead of a new, more a meaningful and kind world, a person received a meaningless for everyone, except for the Zakharovs, Krupps and Morgans, a cruel and long war.

This war was so dishonorable that it rejected more or less honest people on the tops of power and pushed forward the very dishonorable.

In June 1916, Lord Kitchener set out on the armored cruiser Hampshire for Russia. West of the Orkney Islands, the cruiser was blown up, only 12 people swam to the shore. Kitchener was ruthless but direct, and this did not sit well with many. Why he died is not known today. But he died for many on time ... In December 1916, instead of

the "worked out" Asquith, he became prime minister
Lloyd George, unloved by Kitchener, closely associated, in addition to Morgan, also with Zionist circles. Was "on

horseback" and Churchill. Ten years ago, during the 1906 parliamentary elections, Manchester Jews rallied around him so actively that at one of their meetings the leader declared, "Any Jew who votes against Churchill will be a traitor to our cause." What was this "holy work"? What can be the main

business of an honest person? There are no two opinions! A person worthy of this name makes life better for as many honest and worthy people. But did the Churchills and Lloyd Georgie serve this purpose?

Is it necessary to think a lot to give an honest answer to this question?

Chapter 7

CREATING human thought has always transformed the world for the better... However only since the second half of the 19th century has it provided the peoples with truly powerful, unprecedented opportunities to transform life and the planet for their benefit.

In 1869 America built the Brooklyn Bridge and Europe built the Suez Canal. Through two years at the Krupp plant, the world's first open-hearth furnace was lit, and in 1883 Krupp workers in Essen installed the first rolling mill. In 1885, the first skyscraper grew in Chicago, and a year later, the New York Tribune was first typed on the Mergenthaler linotype machine.

In the same 1886, Karl Benz, an engineer from the German Mannheim, built the first world three-wheeled car with a gasoline engine, and a little later, Benz and Gottlieb Wilhelm Daimler also created the first "real" car - a four-wheeled ...

In 1889, the French, under the leadership of Eiffel, raised his new symbol - a three-hundred-meter openwork steel tower that shocked visitors to the Paris world exhibition. A year

later, in 1890, the English engineers Fowler and Baker stretched over Firth of Forth in Scotland, a railway bridge one and a half kilometers long.

Russian builders in 1880 completed the Trans-Caspian highway in Tashkent, and in 1892 began to build the Trans-Siberian.

From 6 to 15 April 1896 in Athens, through the efforts of Pierre Coubertin, the first Olympic Games. And four years later, at the turn of two centuries, in 1900, through the efforts Lord Kitchener (the same one), the world was "enriched" by the "scorched earth" strategy in the Boer War in South Africa.

In the same 1900, the British created the world's first concentration camp there, in South Africa, for the Boers.

On August 1, 1914, the First World War "opened" in Europe, and on the fifteenth August of the same year, the Panama Canal opened in America.

Capital proudly declared that all this, except for the war, was the fruit of its efforts. But bridges, rolling mills, canals, incandescent bulbs, phonographs and X-ray machines - absolutely everything that made life more meaningful and abundant, was created by Labor. But only Capital could justifiably claim the creation of the war as its sole merit.

Twenty-eight years before August 1914, Mikhail Evgrafovich Saltykov-Shchedrin in magazine "Bulletin of Europe" wrote: "Good geniuses lay iron tracks, invent telegraphs, break through huge canals, dream of aeronautics, in a word, do everything to soften international strife; the evil ones, on the contrary, make every effort to exacerbate this strife. Politicism crushes the successes of science and thought, and the most he knows how to turn the significant victories of the latter exclusively to his own advantage "...

This is how a deeply Russian person thought and felt, and at the same time a citizen of the world not in vulgar-lordly interpretation of this concept, but in a constructive, future understanding. Shchedrin subtly grasped the growing discrepancy between the productive power of mankind and the social order of this humanity.

Already a contemporary of the World War, also Russian, Maximilian Voloshin, also said well: "It's a lie that this is a war of races. This is the fight of several state-owned industrial octopuses. They go through their vile digestive processes, and they they send selected young men...

This is how Russian cultural figures thought - figures of genuine culture, that is, humanistic culture. As for

European "humanistic" thought, the French League of Rights man and citizen, through the mouth of its President Buisson, in August 1914, addressed "to the nation" like this: "What broke out today is a death duel between two religions: the religion of Power and the religion of Right. This is the liberation crusade of democracy."

In the meantime, the hypocrites were idiotic, the Berlin electrical company "Sanita" with Friedrichstrasse, 131, wrote to her partner, the Geneva firm Felix Badel, business letter: "Our model of the extendable crutch is a military model and represents the subject essentials. We therefore want to draw your full attention to the issue of exports. crutches abroad; you have no doubt the possibility of doing business with France and Russia and sell our sliding crutches there, which will soon become very profitable commodity."

AS WE SEE, the German company "Sanita" did not need to grieve about the beginning war, if the Germans, not without profit, began to sell Entente crutches for disabled people who appeared in France and Russia thanks to the Germans ... At the same time, merchants in Russia and France, too, did not remain at a loss.

But the British have long been profitably traded in fats, important for the production explosives. And from their colonies they now supplied these fats to ... Germany. From there, cattle feed also went to the Reich. Everything - at wartime prices, that is exorbitantly.

In 1927, the former British naval agent in Sweden, the retired Rear Admiral Consett, published The Triumph of Civil Forces (in 1966 it was reissued under the title "The Triumph of Unarmed Forces" - "The Triumph of the Unarmed forces"). Consett cited in it documentary data on the trade of England with the Scandinavian countries with those goods that were then resold to Germany. Six million tons of copper, nickel, lead, tin, zinc and one and a half million tons of food - that's only what Consett alone knew and reported to London! But Scandinavia was not the only resale channel. Goods from across the ocean and from the countries of the Entente went to Germany and through Holland, through Switzerland...

Already during the presidency of the second Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, the commission Senator Nye not only unearthed information about the connections of American and German trusts, but discovered sensational data on the fulfillment of military orders of the Reich in the United States during war. There was a lot of noise, but the noise was in vain. Could it be otherwise if the number of branches the largest US monopolies in the Reich then exceeded fifty? Someone, perhaps,

was counting on a short war - in propaganda departments, for example, where professional hacks threw hats at the enemy. But people of action already before the war were aware that there were no quick victories in this war expected.

Later, some people wanted to make the Germans look like stupid idiots on the grounds that Schlieffen's plan provided for the defeat of France in 8 weeks. However, top management The Reich did not play at all with soldiers. The plan is the maximum plan. But really in Germany before the war, due to forced imports, military stocks of scarce raw materials (cotton, saltpeter, non-ferrous metals) for 6-12 months. Here are the terms of the war really oriented in Germany. Missed, of course, Germany, but the order phenomena was nevertheless

caught. In the countries of the Entente, no special advance economic preparation was carried out. Not because they were not going to fight, but for completely different reasons.

In Russia, let's say, everything was explained by the rottenness and incompetence of the higher guides. In

England and France, on the contrary, the reason was awareness. To those who planned close superprofits on military high cost, there was no point in accumulating stocks at cheap pre-war prices. After all, they could be requisitioned with the outbreak of war. It was easier to wait and buy during the war, "performing a patriotic duty." A Since the beginning of the war, neither England nor France experienced a shortage of raw materials, with the exception of short period after Germany's declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare at the start 1917.

This kind of warfare on sea lanes could indeed create problems with supplies from the colonies, from America - North and South, from neutral countries. AND created ... But submarines did not immediately become a thunderstorm of the seas. But everything is not in advance provide.

In general terms, Big Capital knew in advance: the war would be long, because he will lead it. And, as from any profitable enterprise, the profit here had to be receive as long as it does not begin to outweigh the possible losses in the form of uprisings tired peoples. In

moments of bitter frankness with oneself, such contradictory figures such as Edouard Herriot. Unlike his colleague in the Radical Party Cayo, he is an erudite, a connoisseur of literature, a connoisseur of music - he was not a man of banks and "two hundred families", although he served all his life in this France. So, Herriot wrote: "In France and other countries, the holders of securities, the bankers, stood above the political figures, they were the true masters of France, invisible, but omnipresent"...

They did not have time in the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the Quai d'Orsay to get a grasp of words of a German note, as on the same evening of August 3, 1914, in a strict atmosphere secrecy, the French government asked "De Rothschild Freres" to take a hundred million dollars from the United States. The gold

conveyor moved ... The role of

a trusted creditor across the ocean was taken over by Morgan along with the duties representative of the French government in military trade between France and the United States. But and the Parisian Rothschilds got theirs: American loans went formally to their bank, and and then to the treasury. The commissions are only for the Rothschilds. Their office on Rue Lafitte began siphon English money after the London Rothschilds released in England bonds of the French loan.

Along the way, Rothschild's Le Nickel sold metal mined in the French New Caledonia, German arms factories. However, the

patriotism of the banking barons was beyond doubt. Edward Rothschild wrote from Paris to British relatives: "It is our duty, as patriots, to make available government is everything we have. United with your people on the battlefield, we must unite our wallets."

The impulse here was truly touching: English and French soldiers in the trenches exchanged lice, and their more successful "compatriots" - shares. Wherein Edward turned out to be so patriotically far-sighted that "giving everything" to the French "motherland", he, in addition to this, simultaneously invested heavily in the shares of the New York railroad and new lines of the New York subway. And when in

1917 they went to Europe for their share of trench lice US Expeditionary Force, Edward was ready to combine his wallet with his wallet and this "new" ally by participating in a war loan from the United States Treasury.

GENERAL Moltke in 1910 spoke to the Belgian military attache in Berlin Major Melott: "As for England, the German fleet was not created in order to hide in harbors. He will go on the offensive and possibly be defeated. Germany will lose her ships, but England will lose her dominance on the seas, which will pass to United States. Only they will be victorious in the European war. England is knows and is likely to remain neutral."

Moltke was born and raised in a country where no one looked back at other people's uncles, and therefore he could not imagine that in mighty England a considerable part of the elite focuses not on the interests of its homeland, but on the interests of that Golden International, which just led the way to the future domination of America. Therefore, Moltke assumed that Britain would go to the destruction of the power of Germany, paying for it with my own might to please Uncle Sam...

The dominance of this gentleman with a goatee and a predatory look. First the world war prepared in all directions. Participant of this war, former officer of the old Russian army, the Soviet military historian General Barsukov wrote a major work "Artillery of the Russian army (1900-1917)". And this is what was said there: "Russia poured 1,800,000,000 gold rubles into the American market, and, moreover, without enough positive results for themselves. Mainly due to Russian gold increased in America, the military industry is on an enormous scale, while before the World War The American military industry was in its infancy. The departments of tsarist Russia, cutting back loans for the development of the Russian military industry, saved the national gold for foreigners. By gratuitous instruction from Russian engineers (*in Connecticut alone there were about two thousand of them!* - S.K.) rich people were created in America personnel of experienced specialists in various branches of artillery technology.

It doesn't remind you of anything, my contemporary of being in Russia, Vladimir Putin?

The information of General Barsukov is confirmed by General Manikovsky in the book "Combat supply of the Russian Army in 1914–1918". Manikovsky's work - research too fundamental, and it says: "Without particularly tangible results for our Army in the most difficult time for us, we had to pour into the American market a colossal amount of gold, create and equip *there with our money* a lot of military enterprises, other in other words, to carry out *a general mobilization* of American industry at our expense , without being able to do the same in relation to our own.

But if foreigners were helped only with gold and intelligence, it would be even more not so bad. The trouble was that they helped with blood. And already at the beginning of the war, Russian blood provided the French with their most important victory of that war on the Marne.

ON THE FIFTH OF SEPTEMBER 1914 on the plain between Verdun and Paris in the region of the river The Battle of the Marne began. Breaking into France, Moltke followed the whole scheme Schlieffen, however, weakened this scheme financially. And it immediately cast a fatal shadow possible failure on all the plans and chances of the German offensive ...

Here Germany was let down by the greed of her ruling class. The upper circles of the industrial-financial bourgeoisie were very worried about the industrial regions of Alsace and Lorraine. on the left flank and insisted on strengthening it at the expense of the most important, "breakthrough" right flank - the "Belgian".

It was, of course, an unacceptable blunder. In favor of other fronts, Moltke reduced initial strike force of the right wing with twenty-five army corps up to sixteen. The reserves were also reduced. The relationship between the right wing and the left decreased in comparison with Schlieffen's plan from 7:1 to 3:1.

As a result of the "blitzkrieg" German offensive in northern France, no it turned out, although its pace cannot be called low in any way. The border battle was won, and by the end of August, the Kaiser's troops were moving forward 13 kilometers per day. For a foot army - very good. Before Paris, where

there was a hundred, and where it was only forty (!) Kilometers! Along the Marne the front temporarily stabilized, but the Germans had every chance to break through it. However, through week instead of the German breakthrough, the French "miracle on the Marne" took place: the advancing retreated, and the imminent victory of Germany was over.

However, there was no miracle, just on August 20, the 2nd Russian Army of the cavalry general Samsonova defeated the Germans in East Prussia at Gumbinen. And although the front of the Russian armies was weak, the general situation in the East was critical for the Germans. On

Things were going even better on the Austrian front: on September 3, we took Lemberg, that is, Lvov. On

August 27, 1914, General Joffre reported to Minister of War Millerand: "Thank God, we have favorable news from the Russians in East Prussia. Can hope that thanks to this the Germans will be forced to send troops from here to

East. Then we can breathe." And the French

sighed ... Up to 2 million

people were drawn into the Battle of Marne from both sides, and in such hot time Moltke had to be removed from the direction of the main attack on the Western Front more than a hundred thousand soldiers to transfer them to repulse the Russian troops.

For a better understanding of the last figure, let me remind you that the famous march six hundred Parisian taxis were transferred by the military governor of Paris, General Gallieni, to a critical moment to the front line on the Marne with only 6,000 soldiers. And they helped dramatically change the situation. And the Russian army pulled back a force ten times greater!

In fact, the success of the French on the Marne was determined by the initial success Russians in East Prussia. And now the Russian troops had to be cruel for this pay the price: a German counterattack reinforced by urgent arrivals from France reinforcements, overturned Samsonov's army.

The commander of the neighboring 1st Neman Army Rennenkampf was a good punisher during the revolution of 1905 and a reliable partner for Jewish businessmen, but mediocre military commander, and he did not support Samsonov. In addition, the tragedy was aggravated by the fact that our the front was still fragile, but New Berdichev was in a hurry: it was necessary to rescue Paris, on which the Kaiser was approaching, it was necessary to save the front on the

Marne ... Actually, something similar could have been assumed even before the war, because the French plans in advance proceeded from the obligation of Russia to start active hostilities in as soon as possible. And in the name of these tsarist advances, the Russian army was thrown into the fire when it had not yet had time to properly mobilize and prepare ... Later, the

emigrant historian of the First World War, General N. N. Golovin wrote: "The obligation to start decisive action against Germany on the 15th day of mobilization

is a fatal decision in the full sense of the word ... Criminal in its frivolity and

strategic ignorance, this obligation weighs heavily on the campaign of 1914 ... This is in the full sense of the word a state crime. There is nothing to argue with here, but it doesn't hurt to ask:

"Who is the criminal?" ... After all

it is hardly possible to shift the blame here on the "damned Bolsheviks", who allegedly ruined Russian army?

Alas, the Russian peasants had to pay for the crimes of the tsar and tsarism. TO On September 14, 1914, the remnants of the Samsonites and the Neman Army were driven out of East Prussia. General

Ludendorff believed: "Our offensive in the West has failed, so how General Moltke took the troops from a victorious position, and thanks to this, September 9 In 1914, a drama took place on the Marne.

But maybe Ludendorff was just making excuses? No! French General Nissel confirms: "We all know very well how critical it was during the battle on Marne is our position. There is no doubt that the reduction of the German army by two corps and two cavalry divisions, to which the Germans were forced, was the burden that by the will of fate she tipped the cup to our side "...

Nissel tampered with one thing - in the end, the bowl is in favor of Paris and the Entente bowed at the behest of the Golden International. It was he who forced New Berdichev, urgently renamed Petrograd, pour the blood of Russian peasants on the burning shares of the Rothschilds and Morgans. The latter was important and meaningful for the civilized, and Russian blood ...

Well, that's how Europe valued her... In one of the conversations with the tsarist chairman of the Council ministers Stürmer - the man was his own and there was nothing to be ashamed of - Maurice Paleolog, the French ambassador to Russia, bluntly stated: "When calculating the losses of the allies, the center of gravity is not in number, but in a completely different way. In terms of culture and development, the French and Russians are not on the same level. one level. Russia is one of the most backward countries in the world. Compare with this ignorant and unconscious mass of our army... This is the flower of humanity. With this point of view, our losses are much more sensitive than Russian losses.

Comments required?

And FOR ALL this, we, the reader, did not even receive gratitude from France - not later from descendants, nor then, in real time. In November

1917, the prime minister of the "government of salvation" and the Minister of War Clemenceau will become France - a vile figure ... A year later he will write: "Brest-Litovsk peace immediately freed us from the false support of the allied oppressors from Russia, and now we can restore our highest moral powers in alliance with enslaved peoples Adriatic in Belgrade - from Prague to Bucharest, from Warsaw to the Nordic countries ... With a military the collapse of Russia, Poland was immediately liberated and restored; nationalities throughout Europe raised their heads, and our war for national defense turned into a war of liberation by the power of things.

Clemenceau had the nickname "Tiger", although he was just a political jackal. So, according to his jackal scheme, it was not Russia who supported France with her blood, starting a war absolutely unnecessary for Russia, but France was "forced" to support tsarism. A the hope of the Serbs, the rest of the southern Slavs and Czechs was, according to Clemenceau, not the Russian bayonet, but French sword. And, therefore, it was not Russia, with its Romanian front, that kept Bucharest from instant defeat? .. Poland ...

Well,

Clemenceau really supported pan-Poland against Soviet Russia in the desire of the Poles to oppress Western Ukrainians and Western Belarusians.

Later, the political heirs of Clemenceau incited this Poland for decades on anti-Soviet recklessness, and then, when Poland was used as a rag with kerosene to set fire to the Second World War, they threw this "rag" over unnecessary.

"Care" by Clemenceau - the premiere of the second world colonial power - about "enslaved peoples" looked only slightly less blasphemous than his arrogance relation to Russia. Alas,

for Clemenceau there were also more amusing metamorphoses. He started out as a radical and proudly called himself "the son of the Great French Revolution", and later, during his tenure Minister of the Interior (in 1906) and Prime Minister (from 1906 to 1909), he invariably stood on the side of the employers in their purely economic conflicts with the workers and took assume full responsibility for the fact that the troops fired on the demonstrators.

He was considered an ardent hater of Germany, but when at the end of the XIX century against Jew Dreyfus, an officer of the French General Staff, was charged with espionage in favor of Germany, Clemenceau defended Dreyfus in his newspaper Oror. It's curious that the banking house of the Rothschilds, on the contrary, carried out the most active anti-Dreyfusard politics, right and left, financed anti-Semitic publications. Jean Jaures said then: "They sacrifice their race to save their class."

This dark story was inflated so that France was almost put on the brink civil unrest. And much later, the "zealot of justice" Clemenceau concocted an absolutely slanderous (there was no doubt) process against Interior Minister Malvi, accusing him of "complicity with the enemy."

And now the likes of Clemenceau were again brought to the fore, so that they played out of themselves the arbiters of the destinies of peoples.

WORLD slaughter - for some, World alchemy, turning steel and lead into gold - for others, by the summer of 1917, it had already lasted three years. I am not writing the military history of that war, so we will do without a description of the battles, front-line details and other similar. Let me just say that both in the West and in the East the war has long been positional, and machine-gun showers, together with fragmentation hail, knocked out people no worse than thickets weeds that grew wildly on the former grain fields.

The peoples were tired, but a long, protracted war was extremely profitable and desirable for those who started it. The imminent end of the war was not only not included in their plans - it simply frightened. In the beginning, the European powers had to deplete as much as possible themselves, get deeper into the debts of America, and only

then ... Then it was possible to wage war and to the finish line, where the reward for Europe would be marches and salutes, and America - unprecedented profits.

When it all started, from the western Russian lands to Berlin there were a little more than three hundred kilometers of relatively easy to pass territory. And this is what he wrote in his memoirs of General Mikhail Dmitrievich Bonch-Bruевич, former chief of staff of the armies Northern Front, brother of Lenin's ally: "On the eve of the war, it was assumed that from by announcing it, Russian troops will lead an offensive against Berlin through Silesia. Be it done, we would probably end up in the German capital. But the right flank of the Russian army for some reason rushed to East Prussia, and this stupid offensive ruined the army Samsonov and Rennenkampf. The offensive in Galicia brought several of our armies into Carpathians, where we are hopelessly stuck.

Indeed, reader! Here is a map of Europe. From the then Russian borders to now Polish Poznan (then - German Posen) - 70 kilometers of *plain*. AND another two hundred and fifty plains - from Posen to the capital of Germany, Berlin. But on

the right - the Masurian *Marshes*, in which Samsonov perished, and on the left - the Carpathian where you don't get around too much either. Wouldn't it be more correct to strike at Berlin, with the aim *mountains*, the rapid defeat of Germany in its very heart?

Nevertheless, the direction to Berlin did not become operational for the Russian troops. I wonder why? Only in mid-November

1914 did the Russian Headquarters seem to have decided to preparations for a deep invasion of Germany with a direction to Posen (Poznan) and Breslau (Wroclaw). The Lodz operation began, ending for both sides to no avail. Russian troops had to not only abandon the movement to Germany, but even retreat. The Germans had a "ramming"

advantage in the main directions, but this "ram" crashed against the stamina of Russian soldiers. On the part of the Russian command was demonstrated at least ... stupidity.

But is it stupidity?

The technical equipment of the Russian army compared with the Anglo-French was "Ahoy". Nevertheless, it was the Russian generals who actively used radio communications, and Russian radio reports were regularly intercepted by the Germans. Actually, it turned out that radio operators of the Russian army provided the German General Staff with intelligence data more properly than the entire intelligence apparatus of Colonel Nikolai ...

Where are all sorts of mythical super agents like Mata Hari! The radio didn't help. to establish high-quality control of Russian troops, but the Germans are always first-hand they knew perfectly well the situation, the location of the Russian units and their intended actions.

Perhaps someone will say that I'm exaggerating? Unfortunately no! This is reliable the academic "History of the First World War 1914–1918" testifies.

After the war, General Falkenhayn admitted that those intercepted by the Germans radiograms made it possible to follow the movements of the enemy, often from day to day with from the very beginning of the war in the East until the middle of 1915, that is, at the hottest time war. The general wrote: "It was mainly this that gave the war here a completely different character. and made it completely different for us, much simpler than in the West "...

And General Hoffmann admitted even more: "Such frivolity made it very easy for us waging war." Of

course!

Actually, the success of the Germans against Samsonov was ensured primarily radio intercepts.

Why did it turn out like this? Is it because not everyone in Russia (and even more so outside Russia) needed a quick, decisive victory for Russia on the Russian-German front? After all, such a victory would quickly end the entire war, prematurely summing up the military super profits ...

And it was necessary for the supranational planners of the World Slaughter for some, but World "golden" Alchemy for others?

General M. D. Bonch-Bruевич was an excellent staff officer, and the political moment caught weakly. And so he believed that "strategic plans turned out to be unfulfilled"...

Once the French politician Wilson, Clemenceau's companion in to the dark railway scams of the end of the last century - the contractor asked: what, they say, will these two politicians be satisfied with the amount for the arrangement of a profitable order?

Wilson went to the window, breathed on the glass, wrote on the clouded surface figure, and then erased.

The "minutes" of the meetings of the Golden International were written in the same way. Decisions melted in the air, but their result was quite material and weighty - by weight gold.

POSSIBLE, someone will say: "All this is speculation!" ... Yes, the enemies have clarifications historical truth is such a favorite word. But what has been said about *the deliberate criminality* of the chosen strategic directions for the Russian offensive is not conjecture. Back in 1913, during a meeting of Russian and French General Staffs, General Joffre urged Russians are in danger of invading East Prussia: "This is the most disadvantageous for us direction...". And then he repeated several times: "C'est un guet-apens ("This is a trap)" ...

The last attempt to appeal to common sense was made by French military circles just before the war. On July 31, France was actually mobilizing. Military Minister Messimy called in a Russian military agent, Colonel Ignatiev, and right in office of the Minister, Alexei Alekseevich wrote a telegram to St. Petersburg, where the third the point was: "The most desirable direction for the French to strike continues to be Warsaw-Posen.

And in Russia, such a view was not new. Professor of the Academy of the General Staff Zolotarev developed the theory of the defensive significance of the Bug-Narev line, wrote about the benefits of the threat the vital center of Germany - the Silesian industrial region. And all these strategic theories were overturned by the practice of strategy, where calculations were based on sand, but sand of a special kind - gold.

And here the accidents were excluded!

About the traitor colonel (now, however, they sometimes assure that he is not a traitor, but an innocent victim of a "coincidence") Myasoedov, exposed at the beginning of the war as a German agent, tried by a court-martial and hanged in the Warsaw Citadel, it is written a lot.

During Myasoedov's gendarmerie at the Verzhbolovo border station, he was often the Kaiser himself invited to the imperial hunts. The noise around Myasoedov first rose in press two years before the war (Guchkov did his best here), and then his best friend Prussian barons resigned, content with dividends from his shares in German firms. The Minister of War Sukhomlinov rescued him then.

With the outbreak of war, he sent his protégé to the commander in chief of the armies of the North-Western Front to General Ruzsky (the figure is also dark, mysterious).

Accidentally or not, Ruzsky, instead of politely getting rid of Myasoedov, sent him to "familiar places" - to Verzhbolovo, where a former gendarme illuminated our 10th Army for a friend of the Kaiser. Myasoedov was "split" by the chief of staff of the front, General M. D. Bonch-Bruевич, for which neither Ruzsky, nor Sukhomlinov, nor court circles, nor current falsifiers of history.

Yes, Mikhail Dmitrievich did not know that there is any kind of strategy ... Including this one ... Russian private industry sabotaged the military orders of the Russian army. Our military agent in France, Colonel Ignatiev, regularly was exhausted, trying to place another urgent order with Schneider-Creusot for gun cartridges. The chief of Russian artillery, Grand Duke Sergei, slowed down the case. Mikhailovich. Delays were eliminated after some time, but in a strange way: always on Mondays.

The secret of the St. Petersburg "Mondays" was explained to Ignatiev by knowledgeable people in ... Paris: "On Saturdays, Raguso plays cards in the Kshesinskaya Palace." Pole Raguso-Sushchevsky is Schneider's representative in Russia. Prima ballerina polka Matilda Kshesinskaya is the "full-time" mistress of the Romanov family, who, moreover, time monopoly "engaged" the august artilleryman.

So, the "strategic line" lined up as follows: Schneider - Raguso - Kshesinskaya - "commission" - c. k. Sergey - order - Schneider ... Meanwhile, French engineers who worked in Russia before the war sincerely wondered: "Why are you turning to us for assistance? Some of your Petrograd factories in their power they far surpass the entire Parisian region. If you even accepted some measures to use your industrial resources, you would leave us far behind you." Well,

this engineering fraternity (for nothing that it was "from Europe") also showed inexcusable naivety. However, not all were such simpletons.

HERE IS THE QUESTION, which sooner or later, but inevitably arises: "What if the shot of Gavrila Princip did not put an end not only to the life of the Austro-Hungarian Archduke Ferdinand, but also on the peaceful life of Europe? What if there would be no World War I war?"

Well, of course, she would have been all the same ...

Yes, even what! Long, bloody, trench, wildly profitable... Exactly the same as it was... Here are the figures from the report of the Chief of the Main Artillery Directorate Manikovsky to the Minister of War. At a state-owned factory, a 122-millimeter howitzer shrapnel cost 15 rubles per shell, and in private - 35! Price difference for 152-millimeter high-explosive projectile was even larger: 42 and 70 rubles. "Our private industry," wrote Manikovsky, "inflated prices for all items of military supply ... In general, the years. industrialists, both ours and in allied countries, showed exorbitant appetites for profit "... The

general clearly did not understand that if such an appetite appeared, then he always exorbitant. I

recommend to the reader the monograph by Vladimir Yakovlevich Laverychev "Military state-monopoly capitalism in Russia (M., Nauka, 1988). Name speaks for itself: before the war and during the war, Big Capital, even in the Russian empire began to organize itself in the same way as it had long ago happened in the West, with the participation state structures. A thoughtful

reading of Laverychev's monograph alone makes it possible to clarify a lot, giving an understanding of whether both the World War and the Great October War were accidental. socialist revolution ... For example, Laverychev reports: "Sugar consumption was at a low level due to the policy of the sugar refiners. And then Vladimir Yakovlevich clearly illustrates this general thesis with an excerpt from the report (of October 1915) of the commission the famous General Batyushin. Batyushin - a major Russian counterintelligence officer of the times First World War, at one time he fruitfully worked under the command of the well-known to us General M. D. Bonch-Bruевич - not only a staff officer and geodesist, but also

part-time, so to speak, and counterintelligence officer. Both

generals more than once painfully stepped on their favorite - "golden" - corns
Petrograd elite viper. Moreover, Batyushin is so strong that the current

the great-grandchildren of those who robbed and ripped off Russia at the beginning of the century, who robbed and ripped off Russia, did not
can still calm down and, mentioning the general, angrily misrepresent his surname in
smaller-sounding "Batyushkin" ...

So, Batyushin reported: "In the All-Russian Society of Sugar Factory
there was a regrouping, and two Jews stood at the head of the whole thing - Gepner and Abram
Kind. Gepner and Dobry (*the sugar factory Lazar Brodsky is also mentioned in the report. - S. K.)* conduct in
the Union of Sugar Manufacturers, set the amount of production, prices
for sugar, the place of its storage and determine the amount of goods to be released on
market. During searches (*in banks. - S. K.)* and at the Kiev sugar factories Izrael Babushkin, Ioel Gepner and
Abram Dobry, materials were found that incriminate both these persons and others involved in the sugar
industry in malicious speculation in sugar, a deliberate reduction in output sugar to the domestic market of the
empire, concentrating
sugar at points where it was not necessary, the export of sugar abroad during
time of war to the detriment of supplying the population with such and, finally, in a criminal
counteracting the supply of sugar to the army "... Well,

to whom the war is a stepmother, and to whom it is solid sugar! Not without reason, apparently, Charles
Maurice Talleyrand-Périgord liked to call this the word "sweet" ...

And this is just about sugar and sugar refiners! There were also bankers
Brodsky, and the Dreyfus grain merchants, and the coal miners Rabinovich and Kogan-Bernstein, who ran
the coal section of the fuel department of the Central Military Industrial
Committee of the Russian Empire, not to mention directly the military industrialists
and quartermasters.

And this is only in one Russia! But

Russian capital on a global scale was just poor
relative of the capital of America and Europe!

So the poor student Gavrila, who "served" as a terrorist, could not shoot at
Archduke Ferdinand, and calmly continue his studies - the war would have started without him ...

And WHAT would have happened if the Russian soldier had not been left to plug himself in the East
holes in the French defense in the West, but made it possible to pull up forces, and only then, when Germany
would be close to Paris and bogged down in Europe, we would strike with a powerful
"fist" in the direction of Berlin?

You see, then the war could have ended and indeed by the first autumn leaf fall, as Schlieffen planned
and the Kaiser promised his troops. But not the way they
planned and promised ... And then

what? Russia

rides into Berlin on a white horse, and Paris, groaning, counts the bruises? London didn't really
fight, and there's no talk about the USA at all, they were in the first years in
formally "did not participate" in the war. Accordingly, the continental Rothschilds did not have time
to unite wallets neither with island relatives, nor with partners on the other side of the Atlantic.

There are no super-profits, extra people are not "relocated to new lands", more precisely underground,
the United States has not been brought into the "high society" and cannot establish its control
over an exhausted and war-debt-ridden Europe. Basil Zakharov, an
arms dealer in all four directions, would also be out of work, as
and the German Krupp, and the English Vickers, like the overseas Morgan and Dupont ...

No, a quick victory, like a war of maneuver, is not for the Golden International
were required.

General Fedorov was an outstanding and educated gunsmith, but politically his
formed life itself - a long, more than ninety-year-old ... And therefore, he, not

having refined his understanding of the political side of things, he served Soviet Russia in the same way honestly, like tsarist Russia.

In his memoirs of how he wandered from Japan to France "in search of weapons for the Russian army", Fedorov does not give a political analysis of the era. This is not his "diocese". But he always accurately describes what he saw, and sometimes shares his thoughts. AND it is precisely the honest soldier's ingenuity that makes Fedorov's notes very useful for historian. There are those reliable points - "bumps", making your way from one to the other, you can avoid the danger of drowning in the bottomless swamp lies of biased and dishonest memoirists.

Fedorov spent World War "on wheels": from Japan - to the North-Western Front, from there - to England and France, then again the fronts and arms factories ... Opportunity to compare with Vladimir Grigorievich was unique, even General Germonius, often accompanying Fedorov in foreign missions, had no "Russian" front-line experience.

So, Fedorov's descriptions of the level of equipment of the Russian and Anglo-French armies make any Russian man grind his teeth and remember "profanity". They have

everything! Guns, shells, cartridges - in abundance. At the beginning of the war, the English the military ministry (the one that was supposedly "not ready" for the war) decided to bring the norm machine guns from 2 to 4 per battalion. But Minister of War Equipment Lloyd George suggested (seemingly jokingly): "Take a maximum of 4 machine guns, square it, multiply the result by two, and multiply the product again by two - for happiness.

Of course, after such calculations, the British battalions did not have 64 machine guns each. But also from reality, this "arithmetic" was not so different, to the delight of friend Lloyd George Sir Basil Zakharov. And

only machine guns! Fedorov writes about Farkar-Hill assault rifles with a 50-round magazine, about the latest models of rifle grenades, trench periscopes, lighting pistols and rockets, about weapon cases, about fur-lined uniforms and leather trousers for trenches...

What scale of production was required for all this?! Yes, even at high the speed of "turnover", with the speed of "wear and tear" of the "goods"! And what at the same time "shone" to industrialists profit?!

All this was possible in the European theater of operations only with long-term, positional nature of the war. It was this kind of war that was established on Western front. Into the French trenches on trolleys on trench railways they brought not only barrels of wine, but even hot water ...

The Russian-German front was far from being so stable, here the maneuverability of the war was higher: either the Russians beat the Prussians, or vice versa. But here, maneuverability also worked to ... prolong the war, because it programmed the transfer of German troops from the West to East and thus strengthened the immobility of the front line in the West!

An early victory due to a series of powerful offensive operations of well-equipped Allied armies in the West?

Uh, no!

Anyone needed this option, but not those who really determined the situation by virtue of real, that is, financial, power. Already after the war, in the early thirties, the American William Bullitt (appearing on the pages of this book for the first time, but not in last time) and the Austrian Jew Sigmund Freud wrote a psychoanalytic study of the biography of the 28th US President Woodrow Wilson, whose presidency took place during the First World War. In the preface to the Russian edition of this work, "new Russian "philosophers" Starovoitov and Tsarev reported that Wilson had America was associated with her mother, England with her father, and Germany, which, it turns out, was the object of his "ambivalent (*that is, contradictory*. - S. K.) jealousy and hatred", - with younger brother...

Alas, both Freud and his "Russian" adherents escaped, and with whom he was associated at Wilson Capital USA? Being

a layman in psychoanalysis, I still venture to suggest that with the owner ... Moreover, the owner is both wildly rich and phenomenally tyrannical.

Europe only before the World War reached the diamond "ball of stones" with involving beautiful human beings. And in the States already in 1883, Mrs. Vanderbilt arranged a ball for ... dogs, whose collars were studded with diamonds.

At another famous reception, the audience was entertained with cigars wrapped in hundred dollar bills. A poor man could last six months on this amount.

An INTERESTING opinion about the magnates of America of that era was left to us by Engels. April 19 1890 in London, he wrote: "In all North America, where there are millionaires whose wealth can only be expressed with difficulty in our marks, guilders or francs, among these millionaires there is not a single Jew, and the Rothschilds are just beggars next to with these Americans.

Engels offended the Rothschilds, of course, in vain. The same, however, as the Jews, whom then in America there was already enough, including among millionaires.

Isaac Singer sold his sewing machines with might and main, and Bernard Baruch sold shares Congolese companies - stocks swelling before our eyes from the blood of black slaves. Levi Leiter and Roebuck traded haberdashery, diamonds and land. Jacob Schiff was co-owner of the largest American-Jewish banking house and at the same time the center Zionism - Kuhn, Loeb and Company, founded in 1867. By the beginning of the Jewish war the list of America's rulers has only grown.

But where Engels was right was in his general assessment of the prospects for relations between European and American millionaires. The initiative and power increasingly remained with the New World. Moreover, if before the war Europe could still somehow compete with him, then after the war ...

About what the war gave in this sense, Lenin, as always, accurately and simply said: "The American billionaires were almost the richest of all and were in the safest geographic location. They profited the most. They made their tributaries everyone, even the richest countries. They stole hundreds of billions of dollars. And on each dollar - a clod of dirt from "profitable" military supplies. Lenin, by

the way, wrote like this in 1916: "A handful of rich countries - there are only four of them, if we talk about independent and really gigantic-large," modern "wealth: England, France, the United States and Germany - this handful has developed monopolies on an immense scale, earns *superfluous* profits in the amount of hundreds of millions, if not billions, rides "on the back" of hundreds and hundreds of millions of the population of other countries, fights among themselves for the division of especially luxurious, especially fat, especially calm mining. This is the economic and political essence of imperialism...". At the same

time, the special position of the United States was revealed even in such detail as the nature national food. In 1915, the warring countries accounted for the following number calories per person per day: in England - 2900; in France - 2749; in Germany - 2708; in Russia - 2514; in Austria - 2486.

An American received 2925 calories. The difference seems to be small. But if you look at "animal" calories in the diet, then everything fell into place. There were 1054 in the USA, in England - 975.

The Germans, French and Austrians had half the "animal" calories of the Yankees and English: 544; 544 and 456.

The Russian, on the other hand, saw half as much meat, butter, milk and eggs - only 279 calories. Let us also not forget that the uneven consumption in Russia was especially big.

Russian economic losses were also the greatest: by 1916, Russia had lost 60% of the income that she had in 1913, with the loss of England at 15% and Germany at 30%.

Can't believe it, reader?

Oh, if I were lying in these figures! It would probably be easier for me myself, but ... So, the Europeans (especially Russians) tightened their belts, and the Americans loosened them. How the fiercer the war was in Europe, the fatter America lived. Already six months after the first major European battles, 50 thousand workers instead of 20 thousand in peacetime. The problem of unemployment was removed ...

And here is how employment in American shipyards changed: in March 1917 (on the eve of declaration of war on Germany) - 25 thousand workers; in the second half of 1917 - 170 thousand; in 1918 - already 300 thousand! The

production of gunpowder factories in the United States has doubled. But if before the pound American pyroxylin cost the French 20 cents, now - 65. Lloyd George shocked Parliament with a message: in only half a month of continental battles British artillery fired more shells than in the entire Boer War.

How did the dividends of British and American shareholders "lion" grow at the same time English politics kept silent.

PROFITS, however, were becoming false. Submarine war declared by the Germans then subsided, then intensified and seriously disrupted the flow of supplies to Europe across the ocean. AND America could no longer leave the situation without direct military control. over thirty two months of the war, the golden spring was very clogged with iron fragments, the bones of soldiers, the firebrands of conflagrations and sunken ships. The source dried up, and the nations began worry. "Business" America increasingly thought: "Isn't it about time?" ...

It was really time for America to enter the war from all points of view ... But how to convince this ordinary American - the primordial "isolationist" of the need?

Looking ahead, I will say that on February 3, 1917, Wilson announced a break diplomatic relations with Germany, and on April 6 - and on the state of war with her. Events forced the Russian February Revolution, conceived and launched with the assistance of British and Americans as a special operation, as a palace coup, but quickly adopted the nature of the mass bourgeois-democratic movement ... It was time to complete that war, from which the United States has already received a lot ... And to end with such a world from which those the US would get even more. Far from

right in everything, but interesting and sometimes surprisingly deep Douglas Reed, an American publicist of the mid-20th century, believed that the First World War happened because the Zionists decided to have their national home in Palestine. In order, they say, to move England to conquer the lands needed by Zion, everything and began. Reid cited some completely crazy figures of the number of British troops in Palestine - 1,192,511 soldiers and officers, clearly not knowing what it is - a million well-armed soldiers in the Middle East theater of operations in the beginning of the 20th century. Reid argued that the diversion of de troops in the interests of reconquering the future Jewish homeland led to the defeat of the allies in Europe.

In England, approximately 5 million men were mobilized during the entire war, although not all of them were at the front. Of these, died: in France and Flanders - 381 thousand, in the Dardanelles area - 22, on the Mesopotamian front - 11, in Macedonia - 3, in Egypt and Palestine - 11 thousand people.

Already from this one can see the absurdity of Reed's figures and statements ... In the spring of 1917, in the area Palestine was defended by 45,000 Turks under the command of the German Falkengine against 100,000 British, including French units. By March 1918, on a 500-kilometer The Mesopotamian front had only 447,000 British, of which 170,000 were bayonets.

The second volume of the "History of the First World War", published by the publishing house "Nauka" in 1975, reported on page 516: "On the Syrian-Palestinian front in late April In 1918, it was planned to carry out an offensive with the aim of defeating the Turks. However, the March the offensive of the German army on the French front thwarted the plans of the British in

Palestine. I had to transfer troops from here to France. Only after the the French front showed some successes, the British began to prepare offensive."

As you can see, the troops were transferred to Europe, and not vice versa. In Palestine, the British troops, who received reinforcements, numbered 64,000. people, and the Turks under the command of now Liman von Sanders had 34 thousand. The build-up of forces in the Middle East became possible after the strengthening of the European front by the Americans who entered the war.

The forces at the disposal of the British were quite enough to artillery preparation at 4.30 am on September 19, 1918, they moved to Damascus, taken on October 1. Biblical Nazareth and the Lake of Galilee were left behind. Considering that in the rear was Egypt with the Suez Canal, then the military presence of the British in the Middle East was fully justified without the pressure of the Zionists. In

other words, Reed's explanation turned out to be more than simplistic, although the motives he noticed, of course, left their mark on some specific features of

war. Here are some interesting facts ... The Prime Minister of England Herbert Asquith and the military Minister Earl Kitchener was not inclined to strengthen troops in the Near and Middle East, spraying offensive potential in the European theater of operations. The Zion-friendly Lord Alfred Milner thought differently, and in November 1915 the members the so-called "Kindergarten" (Milner's mug) from the pages of the newspaper "Manchester Guardian" declared that the future of de Britain as a maritime power depended on Palestine, which should become "a buffer state inhabited by patriotic people, that is, the Jews. And

on June 6, 1916, the cruiser with Kitchener on board, which was going to Russia, "successfully" "blew up" "on a mine" ... Asquith was "convicted" of "frauds" and on December 7, 1916 he replaced Lloyd George, associated with the Jews, and the "master of the lodge" Milner became, as he writes Professor Preparata, "Chief Strategist of the War Cabinet".

And it was hardly just a coincidence that in England since July 1917 the minister Churchill, close to the Zionists, became the military supply. In Germany, the actual imperial The head of the military industry was the German Jew Walter Rathenau from electric giant AEG, and in the US an American Jew, a New York stockbroker Bernard Baruch, headed the most important of a number of special military bodies - the Military Industrial Directorate - and soon turned into the industrial dictator of the country. What was leading here -

Jewish blood or belonging to the propertied class? Of course, the class moment prevailed.

But the fact that by the beginning of the 20th century only hidden financial, but also official political power came out thickly Jewry or people dependent on it, foreshadowed a special cohesion, a special activity, special concealment and effectiveness of the actions of that part of the Owner of the Golden International, for which not only the god, but also the true homeland was the Golden Profit.

Capital was increasingly deprived of its homeland and turned into an international community. under the control of the United States.

EUROPEAN figures have changed in some ways during the war years. At the end of 1916 he left Gray. On the American side, the final was prepared by those who provided the prologue. In 1902 professor of public law, forty-six-year-old president of Princeton Woodrow Wilson University publicly proclaimed that the United States must seek control of the whole world. However, at that time, wealthy America nominated the first Roosevelt, who "planted," as the press wrote, "the tree of imperialism." A lean, nervous, and to perfection sanctimonious, hypocritical and two-faced Princeton professor Wilson was kept in reserve for the time being.

And only when the foundations of the war were laid did US Capital need talents not the assertive Roosevelt, but the educated Wilson. In 1912 he was made president United States, and he immediately begins to create a reputation for himself as a "peacemaker". Describing Wilson, academician Tarle argued that he "had in foreign policy United States legally modest, but in fact the decisive power. However, after three sentences he says: "He was an active instrument of finance capital."

The one who has power is not a tool, and the one who serves as a tool does not have authorities. And so Wilson had only broad powers . empower him Big Capital could only go to war. Tarle wrote in 1927 about Wilson thus: "On the thought of the possibilities and benefits of war for the economic and political future He got used to the United States more and more already from 1915, and especially from the beginning of 1916 ... I note that in both German and American literature there is still such opinion that already from the very beginning of the world war, Wilson considered intervention inevitable."

The last phrase, of course, needs to be clarified: not "from the very beginning", but "long before beginning", not "Wilson", but "Wilson's bosses and creators", and not "intervention", but "tacit and public leadership at all stages of the preparation of the war. True, *such* a clarifying no one expressed an opinion either in German, or in American, or in any other scientific literature ... One

can only amuse oneself with the hypocritical impudence with which Colonel House (we let's get to know him now, reader) at the end of 1915 motivated the desirability-de "more active participation" of the United States in the affairs of Europe. He declared: "The United States cannot allow defeat of the Allies, leaving Germany the military factor dominating the world. And it is unfortunate that this simple fable was taken seriously even by respectable Soviet academics from history, who argued that the idea of entering the war was on the side The Entente arose for American Capital only in the course of the war itself, unfavorably emerging for the Entente, and that President Wilson, they say, also only gradually imbued with this idea ... Keep your pocket wider! Wilson was a confidant directly to industrial and financial tycoons, and Wilson's confidant (although, by the way, tycoons too) was considered Colonel Edward (Edward) M. House - personal emissary of the President in Europe in 1914-1916 years.

Wilson sent House abroad in the spring of the pre-war year on a mission of responsibility and delicate. It was officially proclaimed that House's task was to warn the armed collision. In fact, he was supposed to inspect the readiness of European powers to war. It was a matter of technique to start it if they were ready. In parentheses,

I note that in fact the same inspection mission had in 1940 and personal representative of US President Roosevelt (the second - Franklin Delano), Deputy Secretary of State Sumner Welles, whom Roosevelt sent to Europe with alleged "peacekeeping" purposes. In fact, Welles' voyage to European capitals was not intended let the European war die out and create conditions for the expansion of the conflict through clashes between the USSR and Germany ...

We return, however, to the times before the First World War ... Already in May 1914, House wrote to Wilson: "The greatest chance for peace is to reach an agreement between England and Germany. On the other hand, it would be somewhat worse for us if both of these The powers are too close.

The Yankees, as we see, were hypocritical even in their personal secret correspondence, but there's nothing here do it - you won't get away from yourself ...

Subsequently, the House archive was published, but all the most significant remained, of course, only in the "archive" of the omniscient Lord God.

The first edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia calls House "Gauz" and writes about him as "one of the most interesting figures in the United States during Wilson's presidency."

Yeah ...

Texas landowner, born in 1858, colonel in the Texas militia, he started as a railway worker, like Witte. Here are some more

estimates of the 1st edition of the TSB: "Gause himself did not seek to occupy any official positions, being content with the role of organizer and behind-the-scenes adviser ... With the direct participation of Gauz, the cabinet of the new president is drawn up and held put into practice a number of important financial bills. The main interests of Gauz, however, lay in the field of foreign policy "...

The TSB also reports that House acted as a "silent intermediary" in securing oil interests of the USA and England in Mexico, that he "declared himself a supporter of an active U.S. entry into world politics" and that "he was called Wilson's silent partner". Perhaps this characteristic reminds someone

painfully. And is it Baron Holstein? And also Lord Grey... And was this resemblance accidental? No, of course, not by chance ... Moreover, Holstein, Gray, House were not just similar in personality ... They were similar

systematically, as proxies of not legal, but real governments, who were not in bureaucratic offices, and in business offices and offices ... And a similar systemic situation the owners assigned to the Grays and Houses because of their special - "gray-cardinal" - traits of nature.

In the spring of 1914, while secretly preparing for the war, "Grey Colonel" House visited the Old World. Sometimes, lingering in Paris, he shuttled between Berlin and London, because without London (this was well understood in the States), there would be no war. Here I needed an eye for an

eye. There was no need to get to Russia: there were no problems with New Berdichev, Russia went to the place of slaughter without resistance.

In Berlin, House helped the British partners of American Capital to introduce Kaiser's delusion regarding England's unwillingness to get involved in the European continental strife. By the way,

later in his alleged diaries, House told marvelous things ... Like, in a conversation with him on June 1, the Kaiser confidentially suggested that the United States and England unite against "Russian semi-barbarians" and fight them right up to Siberia ... And what a shame - even in Russia there were people ready to believe House!

In London, Edward House acted in active agreement with Sir Edward Grey. Usually unsociable and gloomy, Gray and House were attentive and, according to the latter, invariably "charmed" him. Well, the fisherman sees the fisherman

from afar ... Himself close at one time to

Wilson, William Bullitt reports that Edward House fed to Edward Gray "almost filial confidence." Given that Gray was four years younger House, the fact of such "love" turns out to be strange. However, both were blue people blood, so that the "blue" kinship of natures was not excluded. Something

else looked strange too. On June 1, 1914, House did have a conversation with Kaiser about the desirability of de European understanding and peace. Kaiser *approved* the project , and the colonel went to England. The path seems to be short, but with Gray is personal the representative of the president of the most powerful power met (*officially* , on occasion) only in every on June 17, and allegedly "to no avail." On June 28, Franz

Ferdinand was assassinated in Sarajevo. And on

July 3, Gray allegedly gives House (for some reason, through the young diplomat Tyrrel), that he was going to convey to the Kaiser information about the peaceful intentions of England.

In London, the German ambassador, Prince Lichnowski, was normally accredited, who, of course, had an encrypted telegraph connection with Berlin. Europe starts to smell thunderstorm, and the overseas "peacemaker" would have to hurry. However, instead of

quickly inform the Kaiser about the mood of England through Lichnowski, House only ... July 7 writes a letter to Berlin, which falls into the hands of Wilhelm after the Austrian ultimatum to Belgrade, that is, after July 23. A week later, the war begins.

The "peacekeeping" mission justified itself... Three days after the start of the European storm, August 4, 1914, Wilson proclaims the neutrality of the United States, and a progressive "pooling wallets". Moreover, contrary to the principle of communicating vessels, on the side of the Atlantic waters they are filled, and on this side they are emptied.

Is it worth it, however, to be surprised: the world of capital does not obey the laws of physics. Besides As early as May 29, 1914, Edward House reported from Europe: "As soon as consent of England, France and Russia will come to the borders of Germany and Austria.

And five months before this "peaceful" dispatch of the "gray colonel" the Federal Reserve Act of December 23, 1913 established the Federal Reserve System - an association of US banks that performs the functions of a central issuing jar. The Federal Reserve System, among other things, also issues banknotes, known as "dollars" (they are also "green", they are also "bucks"). Without going into the topic of the Fed in depth, just I will say that its establishment was one of the final stages of preparation for the First World War war, which was called upon to finance the new global structure of the world financial capital. The

establishment of the Fed in the US and the World War in Europe are two sides of the same medals, and only incorrigible fools - "Russian" "historians" - can call this The massacre of the "national war", "Second Patriotic War" and so on ... As for

Colonel House, during the war he visited Europe several more times and each time with "intermediary" missions, or rather - with new inspections now the course of

the war. The colonel "mediated" between the Anglo-French and the Germans on the same principle that Sir Edward Gray himself "mediated" between the Germans and Russians on the eve of August 1, 1914. That is, at first, Wilson, through House, proposed to convene a peaceful conference, threatening, in the event of Germany's refusal, the entry into the war of the United States. And then feigned hesitation and declared: "We will *probably* do just that, *but ...*".

Spurred on by these "probably" and "but ...", the Germans continued the war, and the British sought to achieve a military victory before the United States could count on its share not only as a creditor and military supplier of the Entente, but also as its direct ally.

It just suited America, it was not very afraid of being late. USA already controlled Europe quite well, and House played the role of plenipotentiary papal a legate that unites the private efforts of embassies, missions and agencies into one whole.

Actually, the "colonel" who never sniffed the army belonged, I repeat, to "fighters" of the same "cohort" in whose ranks both Holstein and the namesake of House Gray served.

The middle name of the blue-eyed blond of Dutch-British origin was "Mandel", and he received it in honor of the closest friend of Father House - a Jewish businessman from Houston. So, pro-Jewish sympathies were provided to the boy from the cradle.

When the boy grew up, a Jewish doctor became the son-in-law and adviser of Edward Mandel. Sidney Meses - early plans for a world super-government and director organization "Research", preparing materials for Wilson and the American delegations at future "peace" negotiations.

In 1912, House wrote the programmatic novel Philip Drew: The Administrator, in which there was a chapter titled: "How Presidents Are Made." In the novel, the technology was next. His heroes "outlined a good thousand millionaires, each of whom had to give 10 thousand dollars." "Only a few businessmen," it was said further, "did not consider for themselves happy to join them blindfolded in the defense of Capital."

The same thing happened in real life as in the novel. One of those with whom the author "Philippa Drew" was closely associated with leading U.S. Zionist Rabbi Stephen Wise in 1910

publicly broadcast to New Jersey voters: "On Tuesday, Mr. Woodrow Wilson will be elected governor of your state; he will not finish the term of the governor's service, as in November 1912 he will be elected President of the United States; after that he will be re-elected President for the second

time. According to Stephen

Wise and left. Here is how a person who knew him well spoke of House: "He avoided publicity, possessing a sense of cynical humor, fueled by the knowledge that he was invisible and unsuspected by anyone - not being rich and not occupying a high position, one personal influence could actually *deflect* the course of historical events. And here are the observations of Wilson's collaborator Bullitt. Bullitt is naturally good knew of House's leading role behind the scenes and therefore wondered how "the same man could noticeably show visible subordination, "that at the meetings of the Committee for the Creation of the League nations it seemed: he "simply turns over the sheets of the score for his master." A familiar portrait, isn't it? House himself

wrote: "It is very easy, without bearing any responsibility, to sit with a cigar over a glass of wine and decide what needs to be done."

Sigmund Freud believed that House became the "substitute" father for Wilson (who was two years older than his psychoanalytic "dad"). Well, anyway, Wilson said: "Mr. House is my second "I". He is my independent "I". His and mine thoughts are one and the same"... Here, it seems, the story turned inside out with Edward Gray, whom House, surpassing in years, loved with "son's love."

It is significant that the journalist John Silver Virek later wrote the book "The Most strange friendship in history. (Wilson and House)" ... For consultation with Rabbi Wise Virek obviously did not address, otherwise he would not have used the word

"strange". House admitted at an early age that he always wanted to have "his own" president. Well he got "his" president and controlled "his" president until the end of the Paris Peace Conference after the end of the war.

Obviously, one can not talk about the fact that Mandel House himself was also controlled.

The MILITARY "conveyor line" of the Golden International worked with might and main ... England pumped out gold from Russia, and the States - already from England. But direct channels appeared more and more often. Rockefeller's National City Bank opened its branches in Russia, was active Morgan ...

In 1916, at a hearing in the Senate Commission on the Survey of the Military industry, National City President Vanderlip was asked: "You kind of took Russia as your sphere of influence, and the Morgans took England and France?"

What the American bankers were doing, that is, making loans a neutral country to warring countries, international law was forbidden, and Vanderlip remained silent. But he almost blurted out out of anger at a competitor: "Yes, the Morgans strengthened themselves precisely there - through

the Rothschilds." However, the Rockefellers also used this "through ...", and here, by the way, it is useful note that Trotsky's maternal uncle, a banker and stockbroker Abram Leibovich Zhivotovsky.

Trotsky for the Russian revolution is an alien figure, even though he acted in it very active. Trotsky already created problems for Lenin, and in the end already Russia Stalin alienated Trotsky from herself, but his phenomenon makes one wonder how anti-Russian combinations of the Golden International could be multi-way ...

In 1916, the National Defense Council was formed in the United States. American the habit of hypocrisy had an effect here too, since this Council was concerned not with defense, but with preparing for an external war. And it would be more correct to call it the Council of Aggression.

In the same year, 1916, Capital ensured Wilson's re-election to the presidency under slogans ... of neutrality and ... refraining from entering the war.

The directors of the elective booth worked rudely, but effectively - in contrast. The Republicans were instructed to demand "to intervene" with foam at the mouth, and Wilson was well he spoke about the world in a set professorial voice. Nothing smarter than American simpletons were not required in America. However, soon hundreds of thousands (and then millions!) of them were to go to Europe.

The eyewitness - the Bolshevik Alexander Gavrilovich Shlyapnikov - is interesting and exposingly recalled how the Americans were psychologically prepared for war already in the summer 1916: "The newspapers were waging a stubborn campaign for American action, while Wilson was limited to notes and peacemaking. However, already at that time for anyone who wanted to see, it was clear that the American capitalists were preparing for war. Cunning and smart they processed the so-called "public opinion", prepared all sorts of ways militaristic mood and soldiery. Churches, manifestations, newspapers, parliament, the star-striped flag, theater, school, cinema, etc., etc. - everything was set in motion, everything preached the defense of the "American fatherland", demanded the creation army and navy.

If old people, newcomers from other countries, touched little and were worried about fate "American fatherland", then the generation that grew up in America, before school age inclusive, responded vividly to this hype. In one of the working areas I had to see the American props "Death of Science", with the invasion of anonymous enemies, the destruction of cities, etc. horrors. And in this proletarian town, children from enthusiastically greeted the American national flag on every occasion, vehemently applauding."

Shliapnikov concluded these pictures from nature with a true and reasonable conclusion: organized American capital holds its power over the people.

So America's transition from stage one, thunder of applause, to stage two, thunder guns, was a matter of clean and already well-developed technology, for the first time tested, as we remember, in England ...

Chapter 8

Wilson's 14 Points of the World

A MASS exodus of "peacekeepers" in tunics from the New World to the Old was furnished in several stages. The story with "Lusitania". It was her tragedy that made it possible to organize in America the first wide resentment against Germany. And precisely because the secret purpose here was the intention to call hatred for the "Teutons", the sinking of a fashionable (with a displacement of 32 thousand tons!) English liner by a German submarine on May 7, 1915 is often described distorted. But the episode was something of an ambiguous. However, rather unequivocal!.. There was a war - the time for cruises is not the best. And the passenger "Lusitania" became a transport ship, for which the Germans hunted, not hiding it. the day before her last voyage next to an advertisement for the imminent departure of the Lusitania from New York to American newspapers published the message:

"To travelers who intend to cross the Atlantic, we remind you that Germany and her allies are at war with England and her allies, which the war zone includes the waters adjacent to the British Isles, which in accordance with the official warning of the German Imperial Government, ships flying the flag of England or any of its allies will be destroyed in these waters, and thus the passengers of these ships traveling in the war zone put their lives in danger. Imperial German Embassy in Washington, April 22, 1915.

I don't know how to explain the fact that more than a thousand passengers (and among them almost two hundred Americans) decided to go on this flight after such a warning. With regard to the crew, it is clearer: for many, the reason was dollars and pounds sterling, because The Lusitania once again carried not only people, but also military supplies, shells, and cartridges. Later, 2,400 cases of rifle cartridges and 1,250 cases of shrapnel shells ... And it

remains a complete mystery why a multimillionaire came on board Alfred Vanderbilt, "King of Champagne" George Kessler and other financial bigwigs who received personal telegraphic recommendations to abandon the voyage on this ship! Under the text was the signature Morte (that is, translated from French as "death").

Obviously, the magnates were attracted to Europe by the urgent interests of Dollars and Pounds, which give

Power and Strength. Off the southeast coast of Ireland, 10 miles from the coast, the liner was torpedoed by boat U-20 captain-lieutenant Walter Schwieger. The Lusitania sank so quickly that most of the people on board died ... Numerical data in various sources differ, including regarding the number of passengers: from 1257 to 1959 people. The number of dead also varies: from 785 to 1154 (according to other sources 1196 or 1198), of which either 114, or 128, or 139 out of 197 Americans. In

any case, the tragedy was evident, and America exploded with indignation. But "Lusitania" was simply "framed". The British Admiralty was aware of the location Schwieger's boats in advance. Back in 1914, Russian sailors sank a German cruiser "Magdeburg" and managed to lift leaded books of codes and radio ciphers from the bottom. Russia shared her luck with the allies, and radio intercepts were very helpful in countering German submariners. So

this time, first to guard the Lusitania off the English coast to meet her an escort was sent from the cruiser Juno and several destroyers. And then he was called back.

The death of the Lusitania was beneficial and necessary for the entire Anglo-Saxon wing Golden International - both to Wilson and his masters, and to the British. The motives were so transparent that the rumor immediately pointed to a young naval officer (his "supply" career was still ahead) Minister Churchill. Well, with the

Lusitania action, Sir Winston really immediately sharply increased his shares on the political exchange of the Masters of the World. The Lusitania did not, however, become an immediate reason for US entry into the war, but helped both in this sense and in more immediate calculations: sharp US protests against Germany broke through the blockade of the British Isles German submarines are better than a powerful squadron.

The Germans were forced to reduce their underwater activity, and the Americans again could without much risk supply Europe with the means to continue the ruinous (for Europe) battles. The

SEA slaughter subsided, the land massacre continued. Over the trenches of the Western front circled six thousand pigeons. However, these were not "doves of peace", but couriers - winged postal employees of the British secret service. In the trenches they grew bitterness and fatigue.

Benito Mussolini quarreled with the socialists and completely forgot that in 1913 he ran as their candidate, denouncing militarism, nationalism and imperialism. In the autumn of the first war year, he left Avanti, and on November 14, 1914, she began to publish his Popolo d'Italia. On both sides of the title were quotations from the French socialist Auguste Blanqui: "He who has iron, he also has bread" - and Napoleon: "A revolution is an idea that has found bayonets."

There was enough iron and bayonets in Europe, it was worse with bread. not foreseen yet revolution. Throughout 1915 and 1916, losses grew, and so did profits.

There were no provocations. In Moscow on May 28, 1915 there was a second (first was October 11, 1914) a monstrous pogrom of German-Muscovites. The destruction was made according to plan, with the

knowledge of the police. In Athens, French agents led by de Roquefey staged an attack "agents of Wilhelm" on the French embassy and staged explosions on the Greek ships, explaining them as "German torpedo attacks." This was done with the aim of complete establishing Entente control over Greece.

Colonel Lawrence of Arabia rebelled the nomadic Arab tribes, and Sir Edward Gray wrote secret messages to Wilson about the need for de peace and "the eradication of militarism." The latter meant, of course, only German militarism, but not Anglo-Saxon in any way. Wilson answered: it was necessary to provide work for future historians.

The British, in order to cheer up the despondent Russian "allies", invited England a delegation of six journalists and writers (Nemirovich-Danchenko, Korney Chukovsky, Nabokov were there).

There was also Alexei Nikolaevich Tolstoy. Then he recalled: "It was only visible good-natured - almost silly - people-shirts. You, they say, yes I, they say, an Englishman and Russian - come on, guy, let's drink. Even Sir Edward Grey, who set the tone for all politics, feigned to be a simpleton and laughed. No other style was shown to the guests."

Tolstoy asked Gray at the table:

"Sir, do you often visit the Continent?" "Oh, no, I have never been there," he smiled sweetly in response. - Why? -

And I'm afraid that my suitcase will be stolen! Ha ha ha...

On September 22, 1916, Gray first used the words "League of Nations" in correspondence. AND it immediately became clear that the League was conceived as a smokescreen over future military preparations for a future, already second, world war. And in terms of such "curtains"

the British pricked up both figuratively and literally: smoke screens intensively implemented by the Minister of Marine Churchill.

However, sometimes a cunning villain can make a mistake. The United States confidently and skillfully led the matter to such an outcome of the war, which was immediately conceived in America, and yet one detail very clearly revealed the fact that America was extinguishing a military fire in Europe kerosene. It turned out like

this ... On December 12, 1916, Germany announced its readiness to "immediately proceed to peace talks." On the part of the Germans there was, of course, an ambiguous maneuver. Yes and how could it be otherwise, if everyone waged an unrighteous, greedy and predatory war. But Germany really was not averse to making peace on acceptable terms. Although the fighting took place on French territory, in Germany it was more and more clearly lacking food and raw materials. Outside observers spoke of "brilliantly organized hunger" in Germany - not in the sense of its intention, but in the sense of a clear distribution meager rations.

So, Germany - according to the statements of the Entente - the "aggressor", offered peace. Entente, if she was sincerely against the war, should at least immediately support the German proposal, in principle, to declare a truce and start peace negotiations...

However, could Wilson (that is, US Capital) allow the war to end without then, when will it be decided overseas?

And on December 18, 1916, "peacemaker" Wilson, instead of simple support Germany's proposals addressed the belligerent powers with a "peaceful", but absolutely non-specific note. The note stated that the President of the United States "believes that the time has come receive from all the powers now at war views as to the conditions under which the war could be finished, and about the forms that, in their opinion, could be recognized in as a valid guarantee against its renewal or the prevention of similar conflicts in the future, in order to be able to frankly compare these considerations ...".

The President assured that he "does not offer peace, he does not even offer mediation, he only proposes that soundings be started so that we are all neutral and belligerents could find out how close the harbor of peace is for all mankind, which strives for it with persistent and ever-increasing lust."

Despite all assurances to the contrary, it was clear that the "neutral" States offer themselves as an international arbiter, but such an option for the Germans was for a number of reasons is unacceptable ... And they reasonably answered Wilson that peace should be achieved in direct negotiations only between the participants in the war.

The Germans were, in fact, right: "two are fighting - the third does not meet!". In history there were precedents for third party mediation, of course, but this was not the case. However, the Anglo-French have already got into American debt so much that it did not work out from there. even "tweet" - a positive reaction to the German proposal for negotiations from Entente did not follow. It is true that the powers of "cordial accord" protested "in the most friendly but decisive manner" "against the equation drawn up in American note, between two groups of belligerents...", but it was, in fact, "a riot on knees."

As a result, the US "peace" note achieved its goal: the war continued because now the Entente had a reason to refuse Germany ... It is

believed that Germany's "peace" proposal was nothing more than propaganda action and only in the last place had in mind the negotiations on the conclusion of peace. But the last goal took place, and Wilson was very unhappy that Wilhelm ahead of him in the "peacekeeping" initiative ... Yes, the Kaiser's "peace" initiative was sustained in decisive and victorious tones ("Germany and its allies ... showed its irresistible force", etc.), but this was an initiative in favor of, if not peace, then negotiations about it.

Nevertheless, the allies, by invitation to negotiations, as already mentioned, did not took advantage. I think they would have abandoned them even if the Germans had put forward as preconditions, those contained in the Allied reply to Wilson dated January 10, 1917 ...

The Entente was already completely dependent on America, and America needed a war in which she had yet to enter.

1917 BEGAN. In the mountains and on the plains of Turkey, the winds and rains have whitened the skulls of whether a million, or even one and a half million Turkish Armenians, slaughtered by the Turks in the spring 1915. And Sir Edward Gray and "democratic" Europe have already digested the joke Talaat Pasha: "The Armenian question no longer exists, since there are no more Armenians exists". And it

was not so difficult for the Entente to digest it, because with the disappearance of Turkish business "arena" of Armenian financiers and businessmen, their place was taken not by Turkish, not German, and Anglo-French capital. Leaflets

were distributed in the French army: "We are being led to the slaughter" ... Corporal punishment of soldiers was introduced in the Russian army, and now the meaning of war explained to the Russian peasant with rods. Tsarism tried in vain to drive "patriotism" through, pardon me, the soldiers' asses, but something else was wandering in the heads of the front-line comfrey soldiers: "Why? For whom? Isn't it time to end?"

From abroad, despite the extremely limited tonnage of ships, they brought to Russia not machines for factories, and barbed wire, which could be made without much difficulty and we have. And if there were machine tools, there would be no need to pay for the work of strangers with Russian gold (overseas including) machine tools.

That's how it was, reader! By 1917, the business of supplying the Russian army was somehow adjusted. But by this time there was not only the cadre of officers and the mass of soldiers was knocked out, but also the "courage" of the war itself. The fuse of the first years has passed. The army, more and more turning into a people's militia both in spirit and according to the level of preparation, she realized at once: "This is not for us, but for the rich." On the eve of the New Year, December 12, 1916, Boris Pasternak wrote to his parents: "Running through the newspapers, I often shudder at the thought of that contrast and that abyss that opens up between the cheap politics of the day and what is at the door"... And "at the door" of 1917 there were already great upheavals. December 25, 1916 - nine days after the palace of his son-in-law Prince Yusupov was killed by Grigory Rasputin - Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich sent nephew, Emperor Nicholas, a long letter, at the end of which he wrote: "No matter how strange, but we are witnessing how the government itself encourages the revolution ... Criminal actions, indifference to the suffering of the people and incessant lies will cause popular outrage. I do not know whether you will take my advice or not, but I want you to understand that the coming revolution of 1917 will be the direct product of the efforts your government... The tsar

was warned about the threat of revolution and the rest of the "Mikhailovichi" - the great princes Georgy Mikhailovich and Mikhail Mikhailovich ... Like peas against the wall!

Meanwhile, America (and, by the way, Japan), taking the opportunity, while European colonial powers bludgeoned each other, strengthening their presence around the world.

But the war robbed France and Germany utterly ... England was also on the verge of collapse into a revolution. April 24, 1916 in Dublin an Irish uprising began, brutally suppressed by London: artillery swept away with fire half the city that surrendered was shot without investigation or trial by the hundreds. Performance in Ireland was more nationalist than class, but internal political it revolutionized the situation, of course, in all senses - not only politically, but also socially.

HOWEVER, in general, everything went like clockwork ... The English fleet established a solid "hungry blockade" of Germany, but the only more or less equivalent response for The Germans had unrestricted submarine warfare, cutting off England's naval supplies.

By that time, German submariners had the best boats in the world, and the most great combat experience. By the middle of 1916, they had 134 submarines, the number of ships sunk amounted to many hundreds, and the total sunk

the tonnage was about a million tons.

By the end of 1916, the losses of the allies at sea approached critical: in the period from October to December 1916, ships with a total displacement of half a million were lost tons, and in 1917, over 540 thousand tons of tonnage was sunk in May alone. The threat of

defeat loomed before England ... The position of the formally neutral United States could become an obstacle for the Germans States, and although the official US reaction to the German plans for unlimited there was no submarine war, the German ambassador in Washington, Count Bernstorff, reported in Berlin, that the declaration of a merciless submarine war automatically involves the United States in world conflict. Berlin

both believed and did not believe. After all, having elected the one who put forward the "pacifist" program Wilson as president, the ordinary American showed that he was not inclined to fight. took into account Berlin and the fact that millions of citizens of German origin lived in America, connections with Fatherland did not break off.

Wilson seemed to remember this as well. On the other hand, by 1917 Germany received loans from the "neutral" States for \$ 20 million, and the Entente countries - by 2 billion, that is, a hundred times more! Such "neutrality" could not but alarm.

This ratio of credits alone - 1:100 in favor of the Entente - was enough for justified distrust of Germany to America. Recently, the Germans wisely rejected the evil American proposal for "mediation", and now also had to ten times to think before taking such a drastic measure as an escalation of the submarine war, indirectly affecting the United States as well... It seemed that the scales were

frozen in an unstable, but balance. And then "suddenly" a certain incident occurred ... On January 6, 1917, the Association of Trade

and Industry in Berlin arranged a dinner in honor of United States Ambassador James Gerard. There were speeches about traditional friendship America and Germany, Gerard and Secretary of State Zimmerman greeted each other, and the US attachés and German ministers kissed each other.

Ambassador Gerard was courtesy and complacency itself ... A gesture (of course, mutually agreed in advance, for such "dinners" are not impromptu are given) was conceived by the Germans broadly and with an obvious hint. Everyone knew that Gerard was only a transmitter of Wilson's will and moods. Not everyone, but those who needed it, also knew how much US capital had already infiltrated Germany. Therefore, "Gerard's Banquet" was regarded by German public opinion unequivocally: the States make it clear that in the war they do not intend to get involved with the Reich.

And on January 31, 1917, Zimmerman in the building of the German Ausamt (MFA) presented to a recent drinking buddy, Gerard, a note announcing the beginning of Germany's unlimited submarine warfare from 1 February.

And on February 3, Wilson announced in Congress ... a severance of diplomatic relations with Germany.

Gerard's provocation worked, and Germany again found itself in the position of a party initiating a negative development of events. There is an opinion that, they say,

"Gerard's banquet" and "launched the catastrophe mechanism." However, let's not be naive: this banquet during the war influenced the general course of affairs in the same way as the Sarajevo shots before the war. It was a visible, public occasion. And the main sabotage against its supposedly German counterpart Capital of America carried out, of course, in

lobby.

And not in one

day. In addition to the "Gerard Banquet", the second "Washington shot" was the publication of Wilson on February 28, 1917, the so-called "Zimmermann dispatch".

The commotion around this ciphered telegram (more precisely, cablegrams, because it went on a transatlantic cable) looks strange and dark. Don't talk about this dispatch impossible: the episode is considered a classic, but to explain it ...

It turned out like this ... In January 1917, the German ambassador to the United States, Count Bernstorff, through Colonel House obtained from Wilson permission to use for relations with Berlin in a telegraph cipher unknown to the US government. Motive is a necessity prompt exchange of views on the search for ways of peace.

Permission was granted, and on January 19 Zimmermann sent from Berlin in transit through Washington a dispatch encrypted in this cipher to the German envoy in Mexico Eckhardt.

However, even in London, this deafeningly provocative dispatch was deciphered by English counterintelligence. And the British through the American Ambassador W. H. Page handed it over to Wilson, clearly in the expectation that the content of such a document would be very by the way for everyone leading America to enter the war. In

the dispatch, Eckhardt was instructed to find out from the President of Mexico, Don Venustiano Carranzas the readiness of the Mexicans to go to war with the States if they declare war on Germany. Mexico was promised financial support and enticed by the prospect of reclaiming Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. Outwardly,

everything looked phenomenally ridiculous. The Mexican Pug was offered defeat the American Republican Elephant with the Democratic Donkey to boot. However, not everything was simple, Mexico was seething then. In 1910 there began a powerful the peasant movement of Francisco Pancho Villa and Emiliano Zapata against the protegee America and England dictator Diaz. In

1911, Diaz fled the country and was replaced by the liberal Madero. But even he did not suit the Americans, and in 1913, again, the pro-American General Huerta overthrew Madero by killing

him. Zapata and Villa pressed on and at the end of 1914 occupied the capital of Mexico City. Junta Huerta collapsed, and the US moved to direct intervention. However, already in April 1914 in American troops landed in the Mexican port of Veracruz, remaining there until October.

Meanwhile, an experienced politician, a large landowner, became the President of Mexico. Carranza. He defeated Villa, but opposed the US imperialist policy and promised to carry out land reform - a strong move. In

March 1916, units of the American army under the command of Pershing crossed Mexican border, but the Yankees did not get an easy walk. Government troops of Carranza and the guerrilla armies of Villa and Zapata, temporarily forgetting civilian strife, united and Pershing was thrown out of the country.

Alas, the Mexicans fought even harder with each other. As the famous artist David Alfaro Siqueiros, who fought on the side of Carranza, Carranzan officer (supporter of Carranza), capturing his former classmate-villista, put him to against the wall... Machine-gun bursts crackled, horses got excited, rushed about in the fever of black pox and hot fights people ...

To turn this poorly controlled and easily excited mass against American "gringo" was not an easy task. But try to at least estimate the probability this was a seductive affair for Germany. It was, in

principle, impossible to rule out the threat of the US entering the war on the side of the Entente. This option has long been real for any decent analyst. Mexicans were able to distract the Yankees for some time when the time factor for Germany

became decisive. For all

that, Zimmermann's dispatch was, of course, an extremely adventurous act. One the danger of information being leaked through an unreliable Mexican side outweighed all possible (and most likely impossible) benefits. The publicity

of the dispatch could become (and became) an excellent reason to "warm up" the private American to militant condition. Texas is not Alsace-Lorraine for you. So and it turned out that the "Zimmermann telegram" factor was used by Wilson to the maximum.

At the same time, it turned out to be systematically similar to the "Gavrila Princip factor". Shot in Sarajevo was carefully prepared from several sides at once and at the right time. But also Zimmermann's dispatch came in *handy*...

Although the fifty-eight-year-old Arthur Zimmerman was a "career" diplomat, having gone through all the stages of the consular service, he was not a typical diplomat for the Reich. IN Ausamt did not come from an aristocratic, but from a bourgeois environment, after the war completely left the political arena, although he lived for a long time, died in 1940. So here we have an example of a strange, dual fate, in which one can easily suspect hidden from prying eyes motives and actions ...

After the publication of the ill-fated telegram by the Associated Press, American pacifists declared it a provocation by the British. In order not to reveal to the Germans the ability of the British to decipher the German diplomatic code, interception technology was not made public, but the director of British naval intelligence, Sir Reginald Hall carried out a cunning operation to cover up the true source of information.

All these circumstances allowed Germany to disown the embarrassing dispatch and following the pacifists of America to declare it a provocation. However, on March 3, 1917, her authenticity was confirmed at a press conference by Zimmerman himself. step, more more incomprehensible than sending a dispatch of similar content. After all, how much do we have examples of lies at the highest state level in situations that are less critical and for lesser reasons...

It remains only to guess, by someone's oversight or by someone's evil will concocted this provocation with precise addressing and precise consideration of what can be finally irritate public opinion in America?

In any case, Zimmermann's dispatch arrived very, I repeat, on time. From The United States, as from a neutral country and far from Europe, the peoples of Europe expected peace mediation. But Uncle Sam assigned himself the role of decisive military figures at the decisive, final stage of the war. And they needed a final reason to stop playing the role of an arbiter and become a direct participant in the "game". Zimmermann's dispatch became such an occasion.

I have already cited this opinion and even took it out as an epigraph to the book, but I will remind him again, it's worth it! At the end of the XVIII century, the most experienced politician and diplomat Charles Maurice Talleyrand, after a forced stay in America - in France, he could then to please the guillotine - the Old World shrewdly warned:

"Europe must always look at America with open eyes and not give any pretext for accusations or reprisals. America is getting stronger every day. She will turn into a huge force, and the moment will come when, in the face of Europe, communication with which will become easier as a result of new discoveries, she will wish to have her say in regard to our affairs and lay their hands on them. Political Caution will then require the governments of the old continent to keep a close watch so that no pretext for such interference is presented. On the day when America will come to Europe, peace and security will be banished from it for a long time."

Now, in the year 1917 of the birth of Christ, more than a hundred years after the prophecy Talleyrand, that ill-fated day for Europe was coming ... House's missions ... Then the Lusitania ... Then the "George's banquet" ... Finally, the "despatch Zimmerman"...

Now the US could take the matter of war directly into its own hands. Yes, it was time ... The submarine war was already threatening England with famine, and the tonnage of ships sunk since its ads, grew rapidly and grew ... America had to rush. On April 2, Wilson asked Congress to authorize declaration of war on Germany. On April 6, war was declared. At the same time, the opportunity arose to intervene more decisively in Russian affairs ...

February 1917 has already come to RUSSIA... It means that the revolution has already come to Russia. Its bourgeois character suited both the Entente and the United States quite well. And he didn't just arrange it - the February coup was directly prepared by the British, but, apparently, it was also prepared in America.

One detail suggests that it was America that initiated February coup even in the first place.

There was one subtle point here ... An ally of England and France was the royal Russia. The fact that it was an autocratic monarchy would be half the trouble, but the hitch was that in America the "Jewish question" in its Russian aspect had been exaggerated for more than a year ... In the language of all newspapermen and politicians there were constantly reminders of Jewish pogroms, for which damned tsarism is supposedly responsible. America she terminated the agreements with Russia because of these same pogroms!

Since the 80s of the XIX century, the symbol of the Democratic Party of the USA has been the donkey, the Republican Party - the elephant ... And harnessed to the same military team with the royal "Pogrom monster" this Donkey with an Elephant was impossible in any way ...

Therefore, it will not be such a stretch to assume that the overthrow of the autocracy was directly ordered by the Entente America in order to eliminate the politically inconvenient an obstacle to the direct legal inclusion of the United States in the war in Europe.

One way or another, the American April 1917 turned out to be systemically closely associated with the Petrograd February 1917: the first politically was hardly possible without second.

However, the Russian revolution did not go further according to the calculations of America and the Entente, and its course liked the Americans and the Anglo-French less and less. At

the end of 1916, Rasputin was killed, in February 1917, Nicholas II abdicated. renounced not at gunpoint of the sailor Zheleznyak, but after questioning his own commanders fronts and fleets. Only

Khan Nakhchivansky spoke out strongly against the renunciation, the rest said: "Go away!". That is why the last palace commandant of Nikolai, General Voeikov, called the main culprits for the fall of the autocracy was precisely this company, headed by the former commander-in-chief, uncle of the tsar, Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolaevich.

As already mentioned, they were rather not the culprits, but the perpetrators of the fall of the king, but this did not change the fact itself: Nicholas was no longer the "owner of the Russian land" ... At the same time The tsar's abdication was demanded by the cadet Milyukov, the landowner Rodzianko, and the monarchist Shulgin...

The train of Adjutant General Ivanov, whom the tsar sent to pacify Petrograd, was stopped on the way not by a Red Guard, but by a railway civilian general, a cadet Lomonosov. Then, however, the "duma member" Shulgin launched into circulation the legend of the dismantled de tracks near Gatchina, but if someone dismantled them, then at the direction of the same Lomonosov or some other civilian railway general...

And I don't see a better way to sum up February than to put it in words. Lenin: "The whole course of events of the February-March revolution shows clearly that the English and French embassies with their agents and "connections" ... organized a conspiracy to *removal* of Nikolai Romanov. A little later, I will give this Leninist assessment in a detailed kind of...

And now it's not a quote, but facts ... Small, so to speak, "drops" of historical truth, by which the taste of the whole era ... The English ambassador Buchanan wore a permanent badge with a swastika. And the swastika was on the banknotes of the Provisional Government, which arose as a result of the February coup. It was repeated three times on the five thousandth bill! It was hardly a mere coincidence. A year before the revolution, Colonel of the General Staff Engelhardt was a cadet member of the Military Commission of the State Duma - honestly admitted: "Rasputin and Sukhomlinovskaya the clicks are strong...". And then he added: "But we can handle them." - "How? – interlocutors were interested. "Yes, perhaps it will be revolutionary. Just like "Left" did not overwhelm ...".

"Left" and overwhelmed. This option did not suit either the Entente or America. AND the general situation was well described by the Manifesto of the VI Congress held in August 1917 Leninist RSDLP (b):

"American billionaires who filled their cellars with gold minted from blood of the dying on the fields of devastated Europe, added their weapons, their finances, their counterintelligence and their diplomats in order not only to defeat their German colleagues in the international robbery, but also to tighten the noose around the neck Russian revolution". As

you know, the United States succeeded in the first, but not in the second. But this does not mean that the States, like Russian Capital, did not try. So, on August 6, 1917, the largest entrepreneur, breeder Ryabushinsky, frankly announced his program: "The bony hand of hunger and people's poverty will be seized by the throat of the friends of the people, members of various committees and councils.

The capitalists of Russia sabotaged production. In May 1917, 108 factories were closed. In the summer, 40% of the metallurgical industry and 20% of the textile industry were already idle.

October 1917 came with Lenin's October Revolution. Back in February this years the Bolsheviks were not the leading party of the masses. Formally, they were not her even after October Revolution: in the elections to the Constituent Assembly (by the way, a week after October), the Bolsheviks received only 25% of the votes in the country, and the Socialist-Revolutionary Party - more half.

However, Lenin was right when he said that the country trusted the Bolsheviks, because that during 1917 only they quickly gained influence among the masses, and the rest of the parties lost just as quickly. Throughout the country, the Bolsheviks received 25%, and in the capital, in Petrograd, where Lenin had the opportunity to most clearly convey his position to the people and where the masses of the people were the most conscious, the Bolsheviks received in the elections in Constituent Assembly 50% - six seats out of twelve!

Bolshevism reflected the aspirations of the working masses. That is why Lenin could win her minds and hearts and win in a fierce internal struggle.

It started, however, with defeats. The old Russian army collapsed, the new one is not yet was. In Brest-Litovsk, Russia and Germany signed a separate peace treaty.

Trotsky sabotaged its signing at first. Bukharin was sharply against peace. Both the one and the one, especially the first one, frankly played into the hands of the Entente and the USA here. Trotsky's refusal of immediate peace provoked Germany's involvement in the anti-Soviet intervention, and with this Lev Davidovich pulled the German troops from the Western Front to Oriental. The

detail, it must be said, is amusing, moreover, if you know that the English diplomatic agent and intelligence agent Bruce Lockhart *a*so sought to disrupt the ratification of the Brest peace and acted in Petrograd in this direction very actively.

In the days before the ratification, Lenin wrote: "And the heavy craft of a man who you have to soar in a bath of scabies. They meant those to whom Lenin diagnosed: "an itch of loud phrases" ... "Permanently

revolutionary" Trotsky ideally suited such a diagnosis. But again, was it only r-r-evolutionary that mattered, or were more subtle and less "romantic" combinations? In view of

the danger of a German offensive against Petrograd, the diplomatic corps was evacuated to Vologda, and Lenin, in conversations with Lockhart and the American representative Robins informed them that Soviet Russia, if the Entente provided us with military assistance, was ready to continue the war if German aggression continued. However, Lenin himself

was sure that the British government would never will do. And Lenin was right: the allies provided assistance, but not to the Russian revolution, but to the Russian counter-revolution.

Lenin, however, immediately calling the treaty an "obscene peace", insisted on its conclusion and ratification under the threat of withdrawal from the Central Committee. Lenin was also supported by Stalin. And bourgeois newspapers we again raised the old topic of the "sealed car" ... We, dear

reader, cannot get around it either. I examined this plot in detail in my book about Lenin "Lenin: Savior and Creator", and there he took up three whole chapters, but here I have to say the same thing. briefly ...

"Historian" Yuri Felshtinsky in the editorial preface of 1995 to the materials emigrant Nikolaevsky wrote: "Having staked on the revolution in Russia, the German government in critical days and weeks for the Provisional Government supported Leninist group, helped her to pass through Germany and Sweden ... Like the German government, the Leninist group was interested in the defeat of Russia.

Everything is not so here ... America and the Entente staked on the revolution in Russia, and this they inspired a revolution conceived as an apex coup, Russian bourgeois circles.

Swiss and Swedish Social Democrats helped Lenin to pass through Sweden. Lenin returned to Russia not on "critical days", but at the height of the Provisional Government's "honeymoon" with Russian society. And Lenin was interested in the defeat not of Russia, but of the landlord-capitalist

authorities, rightly considering such a defeat as a condition for the transfer of power to representatives people.

Finally, in no relationship with the imperial Kaiser government did Lenin was. Later, in November 1918, he instructed the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the RSFSR Chicherin to offer *the revolutionary* German government assistance to Russia for Germany's waging a people's war against the invasion of foreign imperialism. But talks by direct wire with the leader of the German Social Democrats, a member of the Council people's representatives Hugo Gaase, did not lead to anything.

In the spring of 1917, all this was still far away. Lenin arrived in Petrograd on April 16, 1917 from Switzerland, indeed, in transit through Germany and Sweden. But such a route was given to him and his comrades ... by the British.

Here's how it

happened... The February Revolution announced a general political amnesty. Now emigrants could return home without immediately ending up in the royal prison. But England did not let those revolutionaries who opposed the war pass. Therefore the path Lenin from Switzerland through France and England to Sweden and further was closed in the name of triumph of "English democracy" over "Prussian militarism". When passing Lenin through England he would simply be arrested, and this is not a mere assumption. English so then they acted with some Russian political emigrants.

Actually, Lenin at first made an attempt to negotiate with England on passing through its territory under the same conditions under which he later passed through Germany. It was assumed that the leader of the trip accompanying the Lenin group when passing through England, will be the Swiss left social democrat Fritz Platten.

The British did not agree. Let's

not forget that the Golden International has already ensured the connection of the United States to the final stage of the war, and its premature termination was simply unacceptable for the Wilsons, Lloyd Georges, Clemenceaus, Churchills and Baruchs. The attitude of the German government towards the passage of Russian revolutionaries opposed to the war was exactly the opposite of the English. How could the Germans in April 1917, to refuse to return to their homeland those who denounced the world massacre, if back in December 1916, Germany was ready to immediately begin peaceful negotiations?

The imperial ministers were not so well versed in the views of the leader Bolsheviks to understand that they, representatives of war-weary Germany, wanted peace in the name of saving German imperialism, while Lenin called for peace in the name of destruction of any imperialism, including German.

All the piquancy of the situation when transiting through Germany Lenin perfectly understood, but there was no other way to get to seething Russia. Therefore he insisted on the right of extraterritoriality, that is, travel without control of passports and luggage, and preventing any of the officials from entering the car. From here I went to ride "sealed wagon" through the pages of Petrograd newspapers ...

Negotiations with the Germans were conducted by the same leader of the Swiss Left Social Democrats Fritz Platten. He also accompanied Lenin when passing through Germany, Sweden and Finland. The

Russian bourgeoisie overthrew the tsar in order to continue the war. And suddenly comes an energetic man with the slogan: "No concessions to 'revolutionary' defencism! Yes Long live the social revolution! How to

weaken its influence? Well, of course, to report that a "German spy" has arrived. Which is what was done...

HOWEVER, for a "German agent" who allegedly received "millions of gold marks" from the "German General Staff", Lenin behaved strangely upon his arrival in Russia. In the second half of April 1917, a well-known Danish social democrat arrived in Petrograd Frederik Borgbjerg, associated with the German right-wing Social Democrat Scheidemann, who in a year and a half will enter the last imperial government of Max Baden. Borgbjerg on behalf of the Joint Committee of the Workers' Parties of Denmark, Norway and Sweden invited the socialist parties of Russia to take part in a conference on the issue of peace. It was proposed to convene it in Stockholm in May 1917.

May 6, at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet, where the majority was then Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, Borgbjerg frankly said: "The German government will agree to those terms of peace which the German Social Democracy will offer on the socialist conferences..."

Everything was sewn here, of course, with white threads! It was clear that "the conditions of peace German Social Democracy" from the first to the last point will be written in German General Staff and Chancellor Bethmann-Hellweg. So one agent of the German General Staff - without quotes - in May 1917, he walked around Petrograd. It was the Dane Borgbjerg.

How did Lenin "help" him in this matter? And here's how ...

On May 8, the Executive Committee of the Petrosoviet heard the opinions of party groups. For a trip to Stockholm, the Trudoviks, Bundists and Mensheviks spoke out. The Bolsheviks, on the other hand,

Lenin's demand - they declared participation in such a "peaceful" undertaking a complete betrayal internationalism. The

April Conference of the Bolsheviks, which took place from May 7 to 12, 1917, exposed Borgbjerg as ... an agent of German imperialism. Lenin speaking at her 8

May said:

– I cannot agree with Comrade Nogin. Behind all this comedy supposedly socialist congress lies the most real political step of the German imperialism. There can be no shadow of a doubt that this is a German proposal. government that does not take such steps directly and needs the services of Danish Plekhanov, because German agents are not suitable for such services. Position of Germany the most desperate thing, to wage this war now is a hopeless business. That's why the Germans say that they are ready to give up almost all the booty, because they still strive to snatch something ...

The audience listened attentively, although not all faces expressed approval and understanding. It seems to be we are talking about peace, and Lenin is against it. Lenin

continued: "There is no doubt that when the British and French social chauvinists said that they don't go to the conference, they already knew everything, they went to their ministry Foreign Affairs, and they were told there: we do not want you to go there... That is why, comrades, I think that we need to expose this comedy. All these conventions are nothing but comedies that cover deals behind the backs of the masses ... Here's

a "sealed wagon" for you! Here's a

"German spy" for you! But how

convenient it would be for a real agent to hide behind Borgbjerg Germans...

Subsequently, the retired "socialist" politicians of February about the history of They did not like to remember Borgbjerg, and if they did, it was with the clear intention of obscuring this unsightly episode for them. Vladimir

Benediktovich Stankevich (to be more precise, Vladas Stanka), assistant professor of the department Petersburg University and the leader of the faction of the Trudoviks ("People's Socialists"), who left Russia in 1919 and lived in the United States since 1949, wrote the following about Borgbjerg: "The true opinion of the majority of German social democracy was brought by the representative of the Danish socialists Borgbjerg . He appeared somehow mysteriously, delivered a short (?! - S. K.) speech with obvious omissions, then on been shaking for a week. Then he appeared again and said that he could approximately expound the opinion of the German socialists. But this opinion did not impress a reciprocal handshake, but rather an attempt to speculate on the Russian revolution.

In general, according to Stankevich, it turned out that, they say, some small suspicious "riff-raff", which no one (and especially the "Trudoviks" headed by Stankevich-Stanka) did not take it seriously. But the fifty-year-old Borgbjerg time was already twenty years a member of the Danish Parliament, editor-in-chief the central organ of the party - the newspaper "Social Democrat". By October, he was hostile, and in the twenties and thirties he held posts in the royal government of Denmark Minister of Social Welfare, and then - Education.

Therefore, the same Stankevich spoke in 1917 with Borgbjerg "without fools", perfectly imagining the considerable actual powers of the Dane.

ENGLISH, French and Belgian "majority socialists" from Borgbjerg's proposals were refused. They refused, like Lenin, but not for the same reasons as Lenin! Completely submitting to the "employers", they recklessly cooperated with governments, and they naturally wanted to bring the war to a complete victory over the Germans. After all, the United States of America has already broken into Europe and was excellent prepared to ensure this victory quickly ...

They did not support the German (and not the Danish, let's face it) idea and the German left Social Democrats Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, who were then in prison. So, Kaiser's Germany, like tsarist Russia, was doomed to both the "right" and the "left." In fact, they were doomed three years ago. Wilhelm foresaw this, Nikolay, despite Durnovo's direct warnings, did not. Returning to the theme of the doom of tsarism due to

the efforts of its allies, I will inform you that even under the tsar, in January 1917, an inter-allied conference. There were British, French, Italians there ... And a year before that, at the beginning of 1916, in Petrograd, at the head of the British military intelligence mission with special Colonel of the Intelligence Service Samuel Khor appeared with powers - even then a member House of Commons ... Hoare later became Minister of Foreign Affairs and in English politics left a significant mark. The

British ambassador Buchanan listened to Hoare. The chorus, having mastered the Russian language, was well received in the Central Military Industrial Committee (VPK) - the "headquarters" of business people. The choir was also good with the Cadets, with the Anglophile Professor Miliukov. TO word, Samuel Hoare was a fellow student in Cambridge, Prince Felix Yusupov - one of assassins of

Rasputin. Khor assessed the situation very soberly and understood that the autocracy itself was leading itself to collapse. But he did not believe in the State Duma as a "constitutional" replacement for the tsar. very much. The chorus believed in determined people...

Well, Colonel Hoare called the January conference "Noah's Ark." He considered: "Neither the people, nor the government, nor the emperor wanted the arrival of the allied mission ... this large company of politicians, military men and experts ... This was an importunity at the hour trials of their homeland "...

Of course, this was also importunity, but first of all it was a preparation for certain events. The English delegation was headed by the already known Lord Alfred Milner, and this is how the Irish politician Ginnell assessed the essence of his mission: "Our leaders ... sent Lord Milner to Petrograd to prepare a revolution that destroyed the autocracy in the ally country. Ginnell was then in anger from the cruel London's reprisals against the Irish National Uprising, and therefore he opened up, and we are simply obliged to believe him here. In

addition, everything is quite transparent even from the point of view of chronology and sequence of events. As the Soviet researcher I. V. Alekseeva, in early February 1917, the delegates of the allied conferences left Petrograd, and "the ink had not yet dried on their optimistic reports, how the revolution broke out in Russia.

That's exactly what "flared up" ...

Lenin in real time, while still in Switzerland and having the opportunity follow the situation only according to newspaper reports, understood everything exactly. Earlier I gave a very his truncated assessment, and now I will give it in full:

"... Directly servile to the bourgeoisie or simply spineless people who shouted and yelled against "defeatism" are now faced with a fact the historical connection between the defeat of the most backward monarchy and *the beginning* of the revolutionary fire. But if the defeats at the beginning of the war played the role of a negative factor, then *the connection between* Anglo-French finance capital, Anglo-French imperialism, and the Octobrist-Cadet capital of Russia is a factor that accelerated this crisis by downright *organizing a conspiracy* against Nikolai Romanov.

This aspect of the matter, which is extremely important, is, for obvious reasons, hushed up by the Anglo-French press and gloatingly emphasized by the German one. We Marxists must soberly face the truth, not embarrassed by any lie, official, sugary-diplomatic lie the first belligerent group of imperialists (*Entente*. - S. K.), not a wink and giggles of their financial and military rivals of another warring group (*Germany and*

Austria-Hungary. - S.K.). The whole course of events of the February-March revolution shows it is clear that the British and French embassies with their agents and "connections", who have long been doing the most desperate efforts to prevent the separate peace of Nicholas II with Wilhelm II, directly organized a conspiracy together with the Octobrists (*members right-liberal party "Union of October 17" in honor of the tsar's Manifesto of 10/17/1905. - S.K.)* and the Cadets (*party of the big bourgeoisie. - S.K.)*, together with part of the generals and officers of the army and the St. Petersburg garrison, especially for *the removal of Nicholas Romanova*. Anglo-French imperialist capital, in the interest of continuing imperialist slaughter, forged palace intrigues, incited and encouraged the Guchkovs and the Milyukovs...

Clearly, distinctly and to the point! Is not

it? Chorus and Milner did not come to Russia in a "sealed" carriage, the "pure" Russian public greeted them loyally, in contrast to the way they met Lenin. However, it was the British who acted in Russia directly opposite to the interests of Russia ... At the same time, Khor, Buchanan, the Cadets, Milner, Milyukov, the military-industrial complex and much more were particles the same political mosaic.

Let's take a look at another element of it ... Keeping in mind the work of British intelligence officers in Russia in 1917, one should not lose sight of such a little-known fact as involvement in the events of the famous English writer William Somerset Maugham, author of *The Burden of human passions* "... After the

outbreak of World War I, Maugham worked in intelligence, spent a year in Switzerland, and then he was sent to Russia on a secret anti-Bolshevik mission. And in 1938, in book "Summing up", he confessed: "I do not ask me to believe that if I were sent to Russia six months earlier, I might have had a chance to succeed. Three months after my arrival in Petrograd, thunder struck, and all my plans went to pieces.

By "thunder" Maugham meant the thunder of the Aurora cruiser, which heralded the birth of a new Russia. Russian tsarism went into historical non-existence at the behest of the world elites and under the pressure of the Russian elite, and the Russian elite was swept away by the elements of the people indignation.

TALKING about the pre-October activities of the Anglo-Saxons to establish control over Russia, we must also remember the American mission of Elihu Root, which appeared at us in the summer of 1917. This mission is called "military", although the composition of the special mission in Russia included representatives not only of the military and naval departments, but also businessmen and even a trade unionist, the renegade socialist Edward Russell.

The significance of Root's mission was emphasized by the fact that its head was alive after the United States in Francis of Russia - had the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary, and eight members of the mission - ranks extraordinary envoys. A

seasoned politician, Root in 1908 as US Secretary of State signed the Ruto-Takahira Agreement with Japan. Love for Russia, it must be said, is not was different, which, in fact, was the norm for the US elite ... In 1917, Root was 72 years old (he lived ninety-two), and it was he who was honored by the Golden Elite to spend inspection of Russia for its readiness to continue the war. Root had enough experience, he he ate his teeth on foreign policy and called himself a "hardened old campaigner."

About the mission of Root, as well as about the mission of Samuel Hoare, about the mission of Lord Milner, we know few. And surprisingly little attention has been paid to them by historians. But these missions are one of the "keys" to understanding both the history of the First World War, and in general the latest world history. Moreover, the mission of Elihu Root was not just a meticulous inspection, but marked a new stage in the world war.

America directly took the supreme leadership of the war as a guarantee of its future supreme leadership of the world after the war. And Elihu Root came to appreciate

situation in Russia, and to report that the role of Russia's main creditor is moving from England to the USA.

Not the last task of Root was the preparation of such fallbacks for the Russian authorities that would be convenient for the United States ... For example, the dictatorship of the same general Kornilov ... It was necessary to discuss ways to establish a "convenient" government, to discuss candidacies of proxies of the Entente and the United States in this government.

American journalist Bessie Beatty saw a lot in the Russian Revolution during Russian Revolution and wrote the famous book "Red Heart of Russia" about what she saw. She wrote there about the mission of Root, which Beatty observed from the very first minutes of arrival mission: Bessie was among those who met the former royal train, on which he arrived in St. Petersburg Ruth and which the American woman saw for the last time when the royal the family was taken into

exile. The mission was accepted in a royal way, and settled in a royal way - in the Winter Palace, where each morning Beatty and other foreign correspondents saw Ruth at press conferences. These meetings were amazing, because at them Ruth and the reporters switched places: Ruth was silent, and the journalists told him what they managed to find out. But the main

Ruth didn't get the information from them, of course. "From

time to time," Beatty reports, "special missions left Petrograd to find out on the spot some details of a difficult situation. Army specialists

went to the front, the marines studied the reasons for the disobedience of the Black Sea Fleet, the bankers began to study the degree of depletion of the Russian treasury, and the believers went to Moscow to get acquainted with the future state of the Russian Church. Ruta's mission

arrived in Vladivostok on June 3, 1917, reached Petrograd on June 13, and departed on July 9. By the way, Root was also introduced to Admiral Kolchak, for whom Rear Admiral James Harold Glennon specially went to Sevastopol, and the future "dictator of Siberia" liked the "hardened old campaigner".

It was worse with the Russian army, which was inspected by the military group of Major General H. Scott: On July 1, 1917, the army launched its last and unsuccessful offensive in the First world war.

However, this did not discourage the States. Dump Russia as an anti-German force from I didn't want any bills, and Russia's withdrawal from the war threatened to disrupt many US plans! And the ambassador Francis, and Ruth himself, believed that Russia as "cannon fodder" for the West was not lost. Moreover, the "Kerenian" Russia was ready to serve America avidly.

The states have already figured out how to import military equipment into Russia and how to export it from Russia is what it will pay for this equipment. American mission railway experts led by Stevens assessed the "carrying capacity" of the Siberian Railway, and the Provisional Government immediately gave Stevens the status Advisor to the Ministry of Railways.

In the United States, a special "railway corps" was formed to control Russian roads, in 1918, with the beginning of the Siberian dictatorship of Kolchak, he was the Trans-Siberian took control and took over.

The outcome of Root's mission was the American Action Plan for the Conservation and strengthening the morale of the army and the civilian population of Russia. Its essence was is simple: "If you want to have money, keep fighting." "Mission

Ruth," Bessie Beatty also confirms, "stated clearly that the main condition providing assistance to Russia is the further participation of Russia in the war.

Ruta in St. Petersburg unanimously assured that this participation was not questioned and not put by anyone. TO In addition, as mentioned above, Ruth was well aware of the plans of the Russian "top" to establish a hard-right dictatorship.

The chance for such a thing was by no means illusory, and Ruth oriented Washington precisely in this spirit. And on July 13, the Ambassador of the Provisional Government to the United States, Bakhmetiev, informed Foreign Ministry: "The American government immediately opens a loan of 75 million to us."

This was just the beginning. The loan was supposed to be \$325 million under low interest.

However, no foreign missions, including the Root mission, no longer controlled the Russian situation - it was now determined by the people themselves, having taken Lenin's leadership over themselves and the Bolshevik Party.

In FEBRUARY 1917, the tsar was overthrown in Russia, in October 1917 it was the Provisional Government was overthrown ... In Germany, the monarchy also came to an end, as happened in the autumn of 1918, when the November Revolution began in Germany. IN In the ensuing chaos, Germany found itself at the mercy of several heterogeneous forces, common to which was only the desire to overthrow the monarchy. Some aspired to this in the name working people, others in the name of Capital. And although the same confrontation has become the essence of life and in post-revolutionary Russia, to unite the left forces of Germany with proletarian Russia they could not, for nothing that Lenin really wanted this in the interests of the peoples of both countries.

Enemies of the peoples and politicians wished otherwise in Russia. Say, in the spring of 1917 "Trudoviks" and other "socialists" were ready to negotiate with the pro-German political courier Borgbjerg. However, after October removed them from power, they began to portray Germany (not imperial Germany, but Germany as such) as the focus of hostility towards Russia.

After the conclusion of the Brest Peace, a number of figures of allegedly socialist rabble: Baranovsky, Boldyrev, Verkhovsky, Gots, Poradelov, Potresov, Rozanov, Stankevich-Stanka, Surin and Henrikson - published in Petrograd a collection of articles "The People and the Army".

Menshevik Rozanov (namesake of the philosopher) wrote there: "Germany was our enemy in the war, now she has become our enemy. This enmity is for a whole historical period. It is not temporary or accidental, it is not connected with this or that combination of power in us, it is not limited to the Hohenzollerns with their Hindenburgs. She is something more something more serious: our enemy is the whole country, the whole of Germany with all its modern state culture.

Peaceful, it would seem, a man Rozanov, a physician, and how much malice was in his words ... And they show that liberal, bourgeois, intellectual Russia, even with its out of breath stretched anywhere: to the Anglo-Saxons, to the French, but not to that country, hostility with which has always weakened Russia, and partnership with which strengthened it before

just economically.

Yes, and politically...

Enmity with Russia weakened Germany even more than Russia. And it's been good seen on the example of just the Brest-Litovsk peace. Its

history is dramatic, suffice it to recall that in the course of the discussion about the admissibility its conclusion, Lenin was ready to resign from the Central Committee and turn directly to the party mass. The "Left Communists" Bukharinites, speaking out against the world, did not see that Lenin a little later he explained publicly: peace is a respite for the war for Russia. Lenin he reminded me that there were quite a few treaties on "perpetual peace" that did not last even a year ... With the Brest Peace, this happened. But

this seemingly victorious for Germany and humiliating (by definition Lenin - "obscene") for Russia, the world weakened Germany in a decisive way. imperial German elite, instead of making an honest democratic peace with Russia "without annexations and indemnities", was greedy and, having imposed very difficult peace conditions on Russia on March 3, 1918 in Brest-Litovsk, at the same time signed the future mortal verdict on the Second Reich.

If Germany completely demilitarized its border zone with Russia and thus sharply strengthened its Western Front, its chances of reducing the war in the West to a more or less acceptable outcome for the Germans would not be so hopeless.

Instead, by the summer of 1918, Germany occupied all of Ukraine, part of Belarus, the Don region and Crimea, landed troops on the Taman Peninsula, settled on Caucasus, occupied Kyiv, Baku, Tiflis, Kutais, Odessa, Taganrog, Rostov, Pskov, Courland, Estonia and Livonia. The bourgeois

Central Rada of Ukraine pledged to supply 1 million tons to the Reich bread, 50 thousand tons of live weight of cattle, 400 million eggs and other trifles.

According to the additional Russian-German agreement of August 27, 1918, signed in Berlin, in addition to the Brest Treaty, the RSFSR had to pay Germany one and a half billion rubles in gold! So,

a brilliant result for Germany? Well, how can I say ... "Million" -

the word, of course, loud. And now we divide ... Let's say 400 million pieces of eggs for 67 million Germans of the Reich. Not even six pieces per person.

Not a lot ...

But the Germans did not get this either. Different sources give different data, but even if we take the maximum figures, it turns out that almost ten thousand wagons 20 tons of bread per wagon plus 39,000 heads of cattle (that is, hardly more than 15,000 tons live weight) - that's all that the Germans took out of Ukraine really.

Total: three kilograms of bread and two hundred grams of meat for one hungry German mouth for about six months ... That is, the daily "Ukrainian" bread the increase in the table of a German family of four was about 80 grams for everything about everything - 20 grams per

person. There is no need to talk about meat

at all. For six months, the Germans also exported sugar - a teaspoon per person per day. You won't get drunk ...

The "golden" billions remained only on paper: exactly two and a half month after August 1918, Soviet Russia annulled the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk together with all "additional" to it.

Germany won in the East due to the feud with Russia crumbs in the truest sense of this words. At the same time, in the midst of the decisive summer campaign for the Germans in 1918 on on the Eastern European front, up to three dozen German divisions remained from their total numbers in

240. And on the Western Front, the number of American troops alone exceeded time a million people. In the German army, in most battalions there were the fourth companies were disbanded. There were enough weapons and ammunition, but already not enough of

people. In July 1918, the Germans tried to turn the tide of the war by starting the "battle for peace" in the region of the Marne River, which has long taken in more blood than water. The offensive bogged down, and the allies prepared a powerful counterattack, and the "second Marne" remained decisively behind them.

Again, as at the beginning of the war, the diversion of German forces to Russia (but now solely through the fault of Germany itself) at the end of the war programmed the collapse of the German Reich and disaster for the German people.

Russia, instead of healing the damage from the imperialist war, was compelled to wage a civil war. Germany,

instead of making peace with Russia at least by the autumn of 1918 foundation of a just peace and with a final concentrated blow to end the war on West, exhausted itself in a fruitless confrontation with Russia.

Although why "barren"? There

were some fruits, but they were the fruits of discord, and common enemies used them as Germany and Soviet Russia.

IN THE VERY beginning of 1918, on January 8, US President Woodrow Wilson sent a message to Congress containing the Fourteen Points on the Conditions of Peace, which became known as "Wilson's points". On the one

hand, the "Wilson points" revealed a good understanding of the prospects such a world political situation that was beneficial both to US Capital and emerging supranational world capital. In this sense, "points Wilson" it would be more correct to call it not "points of the world", but "points of a new order in the world subordinate to America."

The "universal peace program" in the President's message looked like this:

1. "Open peace treaties, openly discussed ..." and the abolition of secret diplomacy, after which "diplomacy will always act frankly and in full view of all."
2. "Absolute freedom of navigation on the seas ..." in peacetime and wartime ... 3. Elimination of "all economic barriers and the establishment of equality of conditions for trade of all nations"... 4.

"Fair guarantees that national armaments will be reduced to minimum limit"... 5. "The free,

frank and absolutely impartial resolution of all colonial disputes"... These

were the general provisions of the "peace program", and all of them - with an external attractiveness - were either empty declarations, or provided benefits only and exclusively to America. Without explaining anything in essence here, I propose to deal with this for the reader himself ... Then followed, so to

speak, "territorial" and "national" points "peace programs" ...

The sixth point concerned Russia, and I will say more about it in its place, for now citing only the final passage of the "Russian" paragraph: "The attitude towards Russia from the side nations, her sisters, in the coming months will be the touchstone of their good feelings, understanding by them her needs and the ability to separate them from her own interests, as well as an indicator of their wisdom and disinterestedness of their sympathies.

(In brackets, I note that, stating this, the United States was already preparing to covertly finance the rebellion Czechoslovak corps in Russia, without which a serious civil war simply would not would start...)

The seventh and eighth paragraphs referred to the "evacuation and reconstruction of Belgium" and the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France, in the ninth paragraph - about "correcting the borders Italy"... The

tenth point envisaged "the broadest possibility of autonomous development" of the peoples of Austria-Hungary, and the eleventh point provided for the "evacuation" of Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, that is, the liberation of all territories occupied there.

The twelfth paragraph concerned Turkey, and also declared the free status Dardanelles.

The thirteenth paragraph dealt with the need to create an "independent Polish state" with "an undeniably Polish population, which must be provided with free and secure access to the sea...".

The content of "Wilson's points" from the seventh to the thirteenth allows you to confidently suggest that the last person to have had anything to do with their development was their "author".

There is an authoritative witness in this regard - William Bullitt. Bullitt, of course not disputes the authorship of the former chief, and imperceptibly says: "Wilson remained surprisingly ignorant of European politics, geography and national composition. Even after delivering his majestic speeches dedicated to international events, his knowledge of the European continent remained elementary."

The "national" clauses, on the other hand, were drawn up quite skillfully, obviously by those who understood the very subtle "subtleties" in Europe unknown to Wilson. Especially this referred to the idea of a "Polish corridor" to the sea...

The final, fourteenth, paragraph read: "A common association of nations on the basis of special statutes for the purpose of creating mutual guarantee political independence and territorial integrity of both large and small states". It

was a proclamation of the future League of

Nations ... A year before the appearance of the "14 points of peace" Lenin wrote: "American billionaires and their younger brothers (in Holland, Switzerland, Denmark and other neutral countries) ... begin to notice that the golden spring is becoming scarce. At that time, America had not yet joined war, and now, when the Yankees settled more and more confidently in Europe, the "spring" had almost dried up ... Revolutionary explosions in Europe, tired of the war, could be profitable for capital "Spring" and completely destroy.

Understanding that you can't squeeze much out of the military "shop" and you need to open "shop" post-war, and brought to life the American "peace points".

Chapter 9. Military "endgame": America comes to Europe

YES, WITH THE WORLD WAR, Capital should have ended as soon as possible. Soviet Russia clearly set a "bad example", attempts to control her failed, and attempts destroy from the very beginning turned out to be very vague in their results. Soviet power, which at first was given a term of "nothing at all", did not collapse, but fought, and no one could give a guarantee that it could be destroyed.

So, on the one hand, there was a danger of "Bolshevization" of Europe ... On the other hand, by the middle of 1918 the United States had almost ensured the military defeat of the German competitor, but precisely what is "almost" ... And how correctly it was said: "The word "almost" is almost word" ... The Germans were still strong and could present this or that surprise. And not only the Germans ... Let's

say, during that war, there was a certain piquant episode, known only from the words competent member. In the spring of 1918, the Germans again came close to Paris. The French capital was shelled by a long-range (100 kilometers) cannon "Big Bertha", Paris was bombed in night raids by German bombers. This was not a secret, all of Europe was talking about it. Less well known was that 400,000 workers went on strike in Paris.

The allies were in a panic. USA too. American soldiers, just starting their sailing to the Old World, could inadvertently be late. And that's where the "gray colonel" House urgently turned to the influential correspondent of the Hearst agency Carl von Wiegand with order. Wiegand

was not just a newspaperman, he had serious connections, he was friends with Kaiser. And now he had to go to Sweden, and from there to the Reich for ... working out preconditions for a separate peace between Europe and the USA with Germany!

Separate - because then Germany had the opportunity to resume offensive on the Eastern Front against Russia, now Soviet. peace - because the US victory could collapse on the eve of victory.

However, the Germans failed to consolidate the successes of the offensive, and Clemenceau managed to persuade workers. The need for Wiegand's mediation disappeared.

Without being included in the historical annals, this story of a failed peace was not included, of course, in the diary of "Colonel" House. She, according to Wiegand, entered in his diary American ambassador to Berlin in the thirties Dodd. Professor Dodd himself in veracity Wiganda doubted, because, they say, he had not read about it anywhere.

Still would! It was just that truth that melts and disappears without a trace in the air, like sounds an important but nowhere recorded conversation...

Europe "overheated" and could explode with revolutions on the Russian model... The Americans had to, as they say, spur horses, elephants and donkeys. In May 1918 At the Allied War Council at Versailles, the Allied Prime Ministers: English - Lloyd George, French - Clemenceau and Italian - Orlando - sent a telegram to Wilson: "The situation is extremely serious. 162 allied divisions must hold back the pressure of 200 German. Without American reinforcements, at least 300 thousand people per month per no hope of victory." And Uncle

Sam began to send the necessary number of heads to Europe - hundreds of thousands of lives in exchange for hundreds of millions of dollars. By autumn, 330 thousand soldiers were already sent to Europe monthly.

Their real participation in hostilities was not so significant. This becomes clear if you get acquainted with the data on the loss of life of US troops. Their main the share fell on the period from July to November 1918 and amounted to 34 thousand soldiers and officers. In total, the irretrievable combat losses of the United States amounted to about 114 thousand people. (according to some sources - significantly less) of more than two million sent

to Europe. As always, America did not fight so much as psychologically "pressed".

But she pressed, admittedly, on a grand scale.

As a result, Germany was quickly losing even the smallest chances not only of winning, but and a more or less honorable world.

And that's how interesting the paths of the Golden International sometimes turn out! America did everything to ensure that Germany lost the external war. America was useless Reich, threatening to first trample the Yankees on their heels, and then show their back.

But now, after the States had almost reduced Germany to insignificance, after after they clipped the wings of German Capital, America had to take care about the internal political victory of German Capital over the common enemy - the workers Germany ...

In addition, the planners of the First World War needed to preserve the German the potential of European confrontation for the future to provide a base for the Second world war.

The States had enough "old-world" assistants in these matters. Dollars too. Front of the German armies was still not broken, the allies did not even occupy the territory Germany, but the large-scale work of the "moles" inside Germany was in full swing ...

Supranational Capital, with which the German colleagues, it was required at all costs to prevent a social revolution in Germany like the Russian October.

There are no detailed documents on this score, and whether they ever were, but thoughtful analysis convinces us of the idea that the German big proprietors are in critical situation, they decided to sacrifice an already almost lost military victory in the external front for the sake of class victory on the internal, social front. October 3, 1918

in Germany, so far under the Kaiser, at the direction of Wilson formed a coalition government. The head is an aristocrat, Prince Max of Baden, but in the composition already included the "democrats" Scheidemann and Bauer.

On October 5, this government turned to Wilson with a request for a truce, to which 8 October was followed by a tough response. In fact, the Germans were required to surrender.

On October 9, at a cabinet meeting, the Minister of Foreign Affairs asked General Quartermaster Ludendorff: - Can

the front hold out for at least three months? Ludendorff straightened his mustache and answered sharply: "No!

Ludendorff demanded a truce on 28 September. But he meant exactly a truce, not a catastrophic surrender. Therefore, when Max of Baden got in touch with Wilson and the Germans learned that they were being offered uniform suicide, the same Ludendorff insisted that Marshal von Hindenburg address the troops.

The grey-whiskered marshal addressed: "Wilson's answer requires surrender, and therefore is unacceptable for us

soldiers." The army continued to crumble. Ludendorff resigned on 26 October, and on 4 November sailors revolted in Kiel.

On November 9, 1918, the workers of Berlin went on a general draft call. Union of Spartacus.

On November 10, Wilhelm fled forever to Holland. His personal friend, director "Hamburg America line" Ballin, upon learning of this, committed suicide. Chaos was growing in Germany ... In the

history of the end of the First World War, as well as in the history of its beginning, its course, there are many places not just dark, but especially peculiar. For example, most people think that the left The "Union of Spartacus", formed in 1918, was named after the ancient hero ...

Maybe so, or maybe not quite so ... Maybe *someone who knows* remembered order named after the founder of the powerful Freemason order of the Illuminati Adam Weishaupt, who shook Germany at the end of the 18th century ... Adam Weishaupt at the Illuminati was "Spartacus", the historian Westenrieder - "Pythagoras". In

fact, the founders and leaders of the Spartak group, created during war, there were quite worthy workers' leaders: Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring, Clara Zetkin, Julian Markhevsky, Leo Jogiches-Tyshko, Wilhelm Pick...

However, besides them, the group included, after all, others, and without provocateurs and secret spies there, most likely, not done. No wonder the "Union of Spartak" in the beginning of the German Revolution made many mistakes, although he had a successful experience Russian October ...

"Free brothers-masons" and people close to them, always (and in the twentieth century especially) love ambiguity. So to say for sure which shadow *of which* Spartacus was honored in Germany in 1918 is now simply impossible. True,

Ludendorff later loudly declared: the military defeat was guilty Freemasonic influence in the army.

Maybe he was wrong, but here, according to knowledgeable Russian observers - Count Ignatiev, for example, in the French army opposing the Germans, a negative the attitude towards Freemasons was actually regarded as unreliability.

Yes, and Russia was no exception here ... The famous Elena Kuskova, the wife of the leader Cadets of Prokopovich and herself a prominent member of the Cadets, in deep emigre old age pondered: whether to reveal "our common crimes of 1917", or "write them down and then bury the papers in American soil." But she nevertheless entrusted something to paper without subsequent burial: "This movement (*Masonic*. - S.K.) was huge. Everywhere were our people. There were many princes and counts. There were also high-ranking military men. Still the secret is great. By the February Revolution, all of Russia was covered with lodges. Here for Abroad, there are many members of this organization. But everyone is silent. And they will be silent."

However, we will not delve into the "Masonic" topic. Certainly Freemasonry is the most a form of organization cleared of national and concrete state interest Golden World Elite. And this is a very serious and long-standing factor in political history. peace. Freemasonry was formed, grew, improved and changed not only and not two centuries. However, the point is not in aprons and mysticism, but in wallets, in economic and especially in social, class interests. The class interests of Capital are always international, or rather extra-national, and even more precisely - supranational ...

Nevertheless, as it was already said once, in Germany - due to the peculiarities of its modern history - Capital had a very pronounced national coloring. And now, in the autumn of 1918, this predominantly national German Capital capitulated

before Capital International. And the last Reich Chancellor of Kaiser Germany Prince Max had only to send parliamentarians to him. On the evening of

November 7, 1918, the car of the German delegation flying a white flag crossed the front line. The Germans were put on a special train, and in the morning they were already approaching the staff car of Marshal Foch at the Retonde station in the Compiègne Forest.

Foch did not shake hands with them, and with an absent air inquired: - What do you want, gentlemen? We want to receive your proposals for a truce. - Oh, we have - Foch mockingly spread his hands - we don't have any offers of such kind. We really like to continue the war. - We think otherwise. We need your terms to end the fight. "Ah, so *you* are asking for a truce. This is another matter.

The COMPIENNE truce had not yet been signed, and its terms had already oriented Germany at enmity with the new Russia. Article 12 of the terms of the armistice provided that

German troops must leave Russian territory only when "the allies recognize that the moment has come for this, having regard to the internal situation of these territories." If

something was not clear to someone here, then the public comments on Wilson's "14 points", made by him in New York on September 27, 1918, explained everything completely. definitely. The

beginning of the sixth, Russian, point in fourteen "points of the world", "voiced" in America on January 8, 1918, looked like this: "Settlement of all affecting Russia questions that will provide Russia with the most complete and free cooperation of other nations in giving her an unhindered and unrestricted opportunity to take independent decision regarding its own political development and its national policy and making it welcome in the community of free nations under the form of government that she chooses for herself..." About

how the United States and other "sister-nations" "helped" the peoples of Russia to make their own free choice, about how the Entente and the United States ignited and ignited a civil war, and about how they intervened in addition to Russia, plundering and destroying it, one can write a separate book. Or

you can simply report that on September 27, 1918, Wilson commented the sixth point as follows: all the White Guard governments in the territory Russia must receive the help and recognition of the Entente; The Caucasus is part of the problem Turkish empire; Central Asia should become a protectorate of the Anglo-Saxons; in Siberia there should be a separate government, and in Great Russia - a new one (that is, not Soviet).

The peoples of Russia had their own views on American comments. This look radically different from Wilson's, and the "pillars" of American "democracy" occupied a completely unambiguous position in relation to the October Revolution from the very first days after her. As noted in 1987 in No. 10 of the magazine "New Time" B. Kozlov, already on November 19 1917, the U.S. Military Trade Administration decreed that "for the future and until then until the management makes other orders, it is prohibited to issue any licenses for the export of controlled goods to Russia, including licenses for shipping across the Pacific." Secretary of State Lansing, in a letter to Wilson dated 10 December 1917 strongly insisted on American support for the Russian counter-revolution, which was done, although not immediately decisively. However, primarily the United The States, together with the British and French, planned and financed the rebellion Belochekhov, which began in the summer of 1918 ...

Finally, the White House authorized joint intervention with Japan in Russia at a secret meeting on July 6, 1918 - just on the day of the murder in Moscow left SRs of the German ambassador Mirbach. The well-known researcher of Soviet-American relations Viktor Malkov in 1988, in an interview with the Novoye Vremya magazine, hypothesized that the two events were connected, while stating that, in any case, "the synchronism of the events of July 6, 1918 in Moscow and Washington is a fact" .

ACTUALLY, the American "Siberian Expedition" began in March 1918 with parcels to Vladivostok cruiser "Brooklyn", but then everything was limited "surveillance", and the Yankee Marines landed only after under The Czech uprising began with the cover of Japanese troops in the Far East. stretched out from the Volga region to the Golden Horn Bay of Vladivostok, the troops of the Czechoslovak corps became the fuse of a large Russian civil war on a vast territory.

On July 17, 1918, the State Department published a memorandum. Style it was quite characteristic of that America, which in Europe ended up with proxy hands the First World War and successfully laid the foundation for the conquest of Europeans by hands Europeans, and in Asia was forced to reckon with the categorical unwillingness of Japan to be Uncle Sam's maid.

The memorandum stated that America had a negative attitude towards intervention in Russia, but forced to help the Czechs in the name of fulfilling the allied duty.

This hypocritical memorandum had a completely hypocritical background. 11th of March In 1918, US President Wilson sent a message to the IV Extraordinary All-Russian Congress of

Soviets. I will quote it in full:

"Using the Congress of Soviets, I would like, on behalf of the people of the United States to express sincere sympathy to the Russian people, especially now that Germany plunged its armed forces into the interior of the country in order to interfere with the struggle for freedom and destroy all its conquests and, instead of the will of the Russian people, implement the plans Germany.

Although the Government of the United States, unfortunately, is not currently in able to provide Russia with the direct and active support that it would like to show, I would like to assure the Russian people through this Congress that the Government of the United States will use every opportunity to provide Russia with full sovereignty and complete independence in its internal affairs and complete restoration of its great role in the life of Europe and modern humanity.

The people of the United States wholeheartedly sympathize with the Russian people in their striving to be freed forever from autocracy and to become the arbiter of his own fate." An

illustration of this memorandum may be the fact that by April 1918 America captured four ships of the Russian shipping company Dobroflot: Simferopol, Nizhny Novgorod, Tula and Chisinau (they were never given to Russia).

And Wilson's "gray eminence", "Colonel" House, in the same days developed US policy program on the "Russian question", where the first paragraphs were: "1. Recognition of provisional governments that have been created or are expected to be created in various regions of Russia. 2. Providing assistance to these governments and through these government."

And on August 16, 1918, the 27th and 31st regiments of the US Army landed in Vladivostok - a total of 3 thousand people. They came from Manila.

Four days earlier, the Japanese had landed the 12th Infantry Division in Vladivostok, and this is 16 thousand people. On August 18, its commander, General Otani, a member of the Supreme Military Council of Japan, was appointed commander-in-chief of all Allied forces in the Far East.

On September 3, additional American forces arrived - 5 thousand people from the 8th infantry division under the command of Major General W. S. Greves.

In July, America and Japan agreed on joint anti-Soviet military actions and about the approximate equality of forces in Primorye and Siberia. However, in terms of the number troops, both sides violated this agreement ... The future Kolchak minister, Baron Budberg wrote in early March 1918: "Local (*Tokyo*. - *S.K.*) newspapers discuss the question of Japan's action to restore order in the Far East ... Japan awaits what America will say on this issue, vigilantly and jealously following every Japan's step, especially on the Asian mainland." Almost

simultaneously, political steps were taken: the Japanese officially announced the sending of troops to Vladivostok on August 2, and the States on August 3, 1918 of the year.

Appointed commander on September 14, Greves settled in Vladivostok with his headquarters of the American Siberian Expeditionary Force. Formally subordinate to Otani, he stayed there until April 1, 1920.

From the sea, Greves was supported by the US Pacific Fleet under the command of Admiral Knight. The cruisers Brooklyn, Sacramento, Bear, Albany, New Orleans were moored in Vladivostok ...

By November 18, the Japanese increased the number of their troops in Russia to 73 thousand and gradually occupied our Primorye. The Americans followed slowly behind them. They avoided active hostilities, and their combat losses for the entire time of the Siberian expeditions turned out to be insignificant - a little more than two hundred killed, dead and the

wounded. The Americans "fought" no more actively in the north of Russia, where the first battalion Marine Corps was landed in Murmansk on May 24, 1918 from the cruiser Olympia. Total in the north by the beginning of January 1919 as part of the North Russian Expeditionary Force almost 6 thousand Americans accumulated, of which 700 were railway engineers, all during the intervention, the Americans tried not to let go of control over Russian railways, including the CER. At the same time, on January 9, 1919 in Tokyo a Japanese-American agreement was signed on establishing joint control: nevertheless, the Japanese were the main foreign military force in the Far East and Siberia.

In America, the main calculation was on Kolchak, whose troops marched from Siberia to Samara.

By the autumn of 1918, a civil war was in full swing in Russia, aggravated by foreign intervention, thanks to the efforts of the Entente and the United States. In Germany, on November 9, 1918, it was established government, in agreement with Wilson, under the "leadership" of the right-wing Social Democrat Ebert. And early on the morning of November 11, the terms of the armistice were signed.

At 11 o'clock on November 11, an artillery salute in 101 volleys thundered in Paris, announcing this event.

And on December 13 (on the 13th, either by accident or intentionally, in the name of black symbols), 1918, the chief

the "peacemaker" is Woodrow Wilson

himself. True, before "pacifying" Europe and the world, it was necessary to do this with Germany. Although the Germans were not very friendly towards a socialist republic, Germany blushed quickly. And at the beginning of 1919 to Berlin with an urgent and delicate the task was sent to the officers of His Royal Majesty of Great Britain.

The task was really specific, but the life of the Britons was made easier by the fact that in Germany it was easier than ever to find those willing to help. Yesterday's enemies joined forces, and on January 15, 1919, the goal was achieved: in Berlin Kaiser officers brutally murdered Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. problems Capital in Germany immediately diminished.

Soon, and in general, everything went smoothly: on February 6, 1919, a National Constituent Assembly, and on February 13 (the date again chosen such and such whether by accident or intentionally) Scheidemann formed the first government there "Weimar coalition". The

inglorious and mediocre history of the Weimar Republic began. AND IN

PARIS on January 18, 1919 in the hall of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs on The Quai d'Orsay opened the Paris "peace" conference with a speech by French President Poincaré. The Frenchman immediately put forward the idea of dividing Germany into a number of small states. The French patrons of Poincare and Clemenceau clearly wanted to repeat the old the history of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, which ended the Thirty Years' War in Europe and consolidated the fragmentation of Germany.

Of course, these were empty dreams: neither London nor Washington had such an option. suited. But

they were satisfied and pleased with something else ... And the British ambassador in Paris, Lord Bertie wrote in his diary: "No more Russia! She broke up. If only we can achieve the independence of the buffer states bordering Germany in the East, that is Finland, Poland, Estonia, Ukraine, etc., then, for me, the rest can be removed to hell and stew in your own juice. What?!"

It is significant that the English lord was especially concerned about how to fence off "cordon sanitaire" Russia not just from Europe, but from Germany. Judging by this, the lord clearly knew a lot about geopolitics! But Uncle Sam, it must be said, was not inferior to him. Over the ocean also well understood how "red" Russia is potentially dangerous for International Capital. Therefore, they tried to cut it into pieces, like ham before hearty lunch.

Immediately after the October Revolution, on December 23, 1917, Clemenceau, Pichon and Foch for France, Lords Milner and Cécile for England concluded a secret convention on the division of spheres of influence in Russia: England - the Caucasus, Kuban, Don; France - Bessarabia, Ukraine, Crimea ...

The United States formally did not participate in the convention, although in fact they held everything in their hands geopolitical threads, especially laying claim to Siberia and the Far East ... They counted on Russia, "cleansed of Bolshevism", both for general hegemony and for specific booty.

Geographic map prepared by the US Department of State for the US delegation at the Paris Conference, showed this with all the clarity of a graphic document: the Russian state occupied there only the Central Russian Upland.

The Baltic States, Belarus, Ukraine, the Caucasus, Siberia and Central Asia turned into "State Department" map to "independent", "independent" states. Graphic illustration for the September comments on the January "peaceful" clauses was obtained anywhere!

This map also illustrated one more thing: "Golden" America began to seriously consider themselves as the arbiter of the destinies of world civilization. Nothing else could explain the fact that she threatened the future of Russia - a huge, potentially the first (the first not in force of external conquests, and due to internal development) of the world multinational powers.

Catherine the Great called our Motherland the Universe, and a psychopathic American professor, appointed *by someone there* "for president", intended to send (think about it, reader!) Detachments from Christian youth associations to revolutionary Russia "for moral education and leadership of the Russian people! Uh,

Monsieur Putin, Barack Obama's best friend, is ready to pull Putin's friend out of any a dirty puddle if he drowns in it?

However, I again jumped out into the present, and there is still a lot to be said about that old already in the past.

Then, after the end of the First World Imperialist massacre, in an artificial history of the artificial American empire, a new era began - America entered the world as a world gendarme, as a world Derzhimorda ... Almost

seventy years of the modern history of mankind will pass, and the American historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., in *The Cycles of American History*, writes: "We carelessly apply the expression "the end of innocence" to this or that stage American history. This is a quite euphonious phrase in those cases when it is not followed by hides a pernicious delusion. How many times can a nation lose its innocence? It is unlikely that the author of this question himself realized how accurate it is, how much it hits the forehead!

The United States almost in the cradle found the shamelessness of a whore who is able to lose "innocence" over and over again, because it is beneficial and necessary for her.

And every time this loss of "innocence" flooded the white robes of American hypocrisy really innocent blood...

In the beginning - the French "cannon fodder", sent overseas to conquer America its independence in the 18th century.

Then - Indians knocked out of hard drives in the 19th century ...

In addition to them - whipped black slaves ... And

yet - ordinary American guys who believed that they were dying in the Civil War North and South for the liberation of these slaves, but in fact, those who died for the freedom of hands for

Capital growing on the "virgin", untouched juices of the new continent.

But all this happened for the time being, before the First World War, within America itself.

And now, with the advent of the 20th century, another "loss of innocence" turned into rivers blood already on another great continent - in Europe. The

permanent American "virgin" finally went out into the outside world, for in order to "lose innocence" more and more often and at the same time flood our entire Planet with everything greater streams of innocent, that is, *alien and alien* to America, blood.

The "peaceful" Paris Conference was supposed to consolidate such a new world the state of things.

Consolidate what has already been achieved and prepare the conditions for new "innocent" cycles American history.

Part two. Germany - "Cash Cow" of Versailles...

Chapter 1

IN 1907-1909, at the direction of the President of the United States of America, Theodore Roosevelt sixteen freshly painted white enamel paint brand new

American battleships circumnavigated the world.

And in 1910, Roosevelt fooled the public in Osawatomi, Kansas: "I stand for a fair deal, but when I say that I stand for a fair deal, I mean no only that I stand for fair play according to the current rules of the game, but also that I am in favor of changing these rules in order to achieve greater equality opportunities."

In 1917, two months before America's official entry into the war and two years to death, almost sixty-year-old ex-president Roosevelt was already seeking another opportunities - to form a cavalry regiment under his command to be sent to France.

Clemenceau wrote to then-incumbent US President Woodrow Wilson that "the name Roosevelt has legendary power in France," but Wilson did not allow the former competitor to enjoy the new adventurous popularity.

Roosevelt recouped by the fact that he "established" all his sons and husband of the youngest daughter of a Derby surgeon. So that his Theodore and Archibald quickly find themselves in troops, my father got them a personal call from the commander of the expeditionary force United States in France General Pershing. Soon Kermit left for the British troops, and then 19-year-old Quentin, who joined the first military pilot unit in the United States.

Ted was wounded twice, Archie returned crippled, Quentin died. But the war none of the Roosevelts cursed... It was their war. Sons were worthy father, and from that "apple tree of imperialism" that Roosevelt Sr. once "planted", the Roosevelts Jr. "fell" not far. The example of the

Roosevelt family proves well that the United States in Europe fought something to change the rules of the "game", but not in order to "achieve more substantial equality of opportunity", but in order to ensure future absolute inequality in favor of the United States.

America came to Europe not for the sake of Europe, but for the sake of America. Overseas Capital prepared this war, he won it. For myself!

Immediately after the end of the war, this seemed to become clear to the obvious. The fact that, as a result of the war, America concentrated almost the entire gold reserve of the world, spoke for itself ... However, sixty years later, the authors of the Soviet "History of the First World War" for some reason retold the old stories of "Colonel" House and naively believed that the States had to enter the war simply because they were too turned out to be economically connected with the countries of the Entente, to which America even before its entry into the war provided loans for an amount a hundred times greater than Germany.

But it was the other way around! Just in order to "strongly" bind to yourself countries of the Entente and defeat Germany, the United States has long planned this war. That is why they did 99% of their military "business" in alliance with the Entente and against Germany.

One "German" percentage of loans was just a fig leaf on the American "neutrality". And besides, why not cash in on the Germans, at least "in small ways", already during the war?

But to tear especially large percentages from defeated Germany to America was in the future - after the war.

On the eve of the war, in the autumn of 1913, they wandered around the Mediterranean for a month and a half again while US battleships sent there at the behest of Cousin Theodore Roosevelt - Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Deputy Secretary of the Navy in the government of President Wilson and the future "thrice" President of the United States. Perhaps in America this visit to someone seemed like a "visit of friendship", but for such an action one would be enough battleship, well -

couples ...

And nine? This, sorry, was not just a demonstration of strength, but simply intimidation of Europe exclusively "neutral" America ... In April 1917,

America's entry into the war gave it a new impetus, but in December 1917, Wilson "confessed" to Bullitt: "I hate all war, and the only thing I care about on earth is the world I'm about to establish."

The American president spoke well, but one thing was bad: he lied. Lenin explained the state of affairs is different, in essence: "To tear off with the help of *this* war even more skins from the oxen of hired labor, perhaps, is no longer possible - this is one of the deepest economic foundations of the now observed turn in world politics.

In order to rip off these skins already with the help of the world, to make Germany "cash cow", and the Paris Conference was arranged.

A lot of words were said there, together with the technical staff in Paris several thousand people gathered. On February 14, 1919, after a month of bickering, Wilson, for example, pompously recited as if he were giving a lecture: "The veil of mistrust and intrigue was asleep. People look each other in the face and say: we are brothers, and we have a common goal. We were not aware of this before, but now we are aware of it. And here is our contract brotherhood and

friendship. Even Wilson's (or his speechwriters') manner of speaking was disgustingly hypocritical... Similar - falsely eloquent - hypocrisy different, I must say, and Churchill ... Yes, and is he alone ?!

But everything was determined not by words, but by the reality that prevailed on the planet by the end of January 1919.

The WAR in Europe is over. But not everywhere and not for everyone. All the way to peace not a single major participant in the war returned to life in 1919. According to the new Soviet Russia - in the Urals, in the Volga region, in Siberia - a wave of revolt of the White Czech corps rolled, cheered up by dollars, francs and pounds ... In May 1918, the rebellious echelons stretched for thousands of kilometers from the Volga to Baikal and further to the Pacific Ocean. From their simultaneous performance and a big civil war began ... So far, the "Supreme Ruler"

Kolchak, a creature of the English intelligence and American patrons. Kolchak made acquaintance with the Yankees in the summer of 1917, during the time of the arrival of the Elihu Ruth mission in Russia, and it was the Yankees who brought the admiral to the fore ... Czechs, Americans, Japanese occupied Vladivostok and the Far East ... In the military the Japanese were especially active in respect, but America expected to take its future: the local bourgeoisie was prone to American patronage.

The British landed in Arkhangelsk and Murmansk. They occupied Baku... Supported by the Entente, General Denikin gathered the Armed Forces of the South of Russia... Old Man Makhno beat either "whites", then "reds", then his own... "Returning from Berdyansk," he told his chief of staff, a former railway engineer

Belash, - shot the commandant of the Upper Tokmak station. Such a bastard, the guy was good, remember, we appointed him commandant after the occupation of Berdyansk. Now posted poster: "Beat the Jews, save the revolution, long live Father Makhno!". I punched him..."

Yes, in the South of Russia everything was mixed up especially cool and temperamentally. In Odessa the Anglo-French squadron smoked with chimneys, and Grigory Kotovsky spent his Odessa

operations, sometimes in the jacket of a French officer, then in the tailcoat of a merchant who "escaped from the Bolsheviks". Little Jeanne Labourbe, who worked among the French sailors, had one invariable form is the charm of the Frenchwoman and the experience of the revolutionary. counterintelligence invaders arrested her, and Jeanne was shot, but the French squadron soon left Odessa left, the "republican" tricolor flag over military courts flooded more and more one color - red, and the French got away from sin, from this crazy Russia away ...

Operational reports came from the fronts of the Hungarian Soviet Republic: "The Red Army of Soviet Hungary occupied the front line in the Romanian sector: Berek, Minoslikola - Falva, Antafalva, but withdrew from the Fules railway junction. On Czechoslovak front, our attacks continue.

Germany was also disturbed by skirmishes throughout the territory - from Kiel to Munich. The government troops of General Leki fired on the revolutionary sailors. In Berlin detachments of the military commissar of the government of the Social Democrat Gustav Noske committed atrocities, who simply shot the workers who surrendered as prisoners, publicly declaring: "Someone must become a bloody dog." These are just the officers of the cavalry headquarters subordinate to him. divisions, three days before the start of the Paris "peace" conference, killed Luxembourg and Liebknecht: at first they brutally beat him with gun butts, and then they finished him off with shots in the head.

Then still a young referendary, the future royal Prussian adviser Gunther Gereke, a holder of the Iron Cross and a war invalid, had just become a county lieutenant Nauen. He wrote: "The food situation in the area was catastrophic. workers were starving, their families were in need of daily bread.

Another young officer of the ended war is Ernst von Salomon, who became punisher of the Volunteer Corps, gave an impressive picture of two Germanys: "We entered the suburbs. Around stood quiet cozy houses, entwined with ivy, from where we had fun greeted us and threw flowers to us..." It was the

Germany of the burghers... There was, however, another Germany: "Once I entered the proletarian barracks. my the sight of a tiny, no more than ten feet square room, lined with beds, was opened to my eyes. Seven people slept in this tightness - men, women, children ... To a non-commissioned officer approached the women; one swiftly threw back the blanket, pulled up her shirt, and, turning her white buttocks towards him, made a loud obscene sound. We recoiled... Even the children laughed; they, along with the women, shouted to us: "Pigs!" ... "

"We wanted to save the citizens," Salomon concluded, "but we saved and preserved bourgeoisie"...

The rooms of the once respectable Hotel Adlon smelled of mildew, and one sleeve the doorman was empty. The empty sleeve is not an attempt by the author to "revive" the story with a sharp detail, but a reality known from the memories of those who saw it all with their gases.

"Verboten" ("Forbidden") signs were all over the place, and police officers were everywhere. There was a heavy machine gun at the corner of Berenstrasse.

Prostitutes on Friedrichstrasse served only for francs, pounds and - here and there not a conversation at all - for dollars. But the beggars in as yet decent costumes refused stamps and were embarrassed by their unaccustomedness to the business that they had to get busy.

It was uncomfortable and chilly in Berlin, and the beggars shivered both from the cold and from the noise. banquets at the Adlon Hotel, which the wife of a famous lawyer, a former member of the IV State Duma, Cadet Alexandrov, arranged in honor of French officers. Corks popped, beggars trembled under the windows, champagne poured, toasts sounded for France, England, America, new Germany and the victory of the white armies. And at the corner of Berenstrasse stood a heavy machine gun.

AUTHORITY had the power to execute, but could not stop the collapse. The sapper company of Lieutenant Vinzenz Müller received an order to leave Kassel for Berlin on replenishment of the reserve guards engineer battalion. In the morning she was already clearly striding towards barracks in Köpenick, surprising passers-by with bearing and harmony of rows. From the side Unter den Linden now and then heard rifle and machine-gun fire. For the next Müller was awakened in the morning by the company

sergeant major: "Mr. Oberleutnant, the company has

disappeared. - That is? - The Berliners fled to their homes, and then the rest went to the stations. Left five non-commissioned officers, and

that's it. The authorized representative of the Council of Soldiers' Deputies reacted calmly to what had happened: in Berlin happened now and not like that. He gave Muller a civilian leather coat and cap, because it was dangerous to appear in the city in an officer's uniform with insignia. A

a couple of hours later, in the military engineering department of the Prussian War Ministry, the chief lieutenant was offered: "Do you want to voluntarily enter the Border Guard "East"?.."

Mueller agreed. The

head of the Border Guard was General von Seeckt, and she was stationed on semi-spontaneously emerged German-Polish border and in the Baltic. In fact, these were the most disciplined troops in Germany, not counting the counter-revolutionary detachments Volunteer corps - freikor.

Major Bischof's Iron Division was stationed in the Siauliai area, advancing on Riga Major General Count von der Goltz. German troops still held out in Ukraine, although from there they were swept away not only by the Russian, but also by the German

revolution. The Eastern troops of capitulated Germany seriously helped the Entente in its intervention against Russia. With the connivance of the Entente, they suppressed the Soviet power in the Baltic and hung over Petrograd.

The Treaty of Versailles was being prepared in Paris, and the German Border Guard served the interests of both the victorious powers and future plans for the annexation of the Baltic states Germany.

The High Command, that is, Hindenburg and General Groener, even counted on major operations against Soviet Russia in alliance with the Entente. However, in reality the Germans were already incapable of large-scale military operations, and the Entente was leaning towards thoughts about the temporary exclusion of Germany from the European power "disposition". The use of German troops against Russia could have been firefighting kerosene.

Yes, and objectively, the potential of Germany as a strangler of the Russian revolution was doubtful. As long as the Reich existed, the Bolsheviks were accused of obediently carry out instructions from Berlin in exchange for the fact that Germany is eliminated from interfering in Russian affairs. In fact, Germany intervened to the extent that it capable, but no more than she was capable.

There were also

curiosities ... In the preface of the 90s to the article of the emigrant Melgunov "The Opening Curtain", a certain S. N. Dmitriev reported that on July 21, 1918, "German Commission No.

Republic" under the command of Lieutenant Balk captivated the participants in Yaroslavl anti-Soviet rebellion organized by Savinkov. According to

Dmitriev, who referred to the "Red Book of the Cheka", it turned out that with the blessings of the Council of People's Commissars, the soldiers of Balk ordered in Yaroslavl just like in Vaterlyande, and Balk even allegedly issued orders to the "Civilian population of the city Yaroslavl "... But Dmitriev simply tore out five lines from the multi-page report of the Cheka, which, of course, gives a different picture ...

On July 6, 1918, Yaroslavl was taken by surprise by a rebellion of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and White Guards... Arrests and executions began. And a week later they pulled up to Yaroslavl Soviet infantry units, armored cars, an armored train, artillery... The city was surrounded.

Another week passed ... And, finding themselves in a hopeless situation, the rebels found the "way out" is that ... they declared themselves at war with Germany (!), And then, declaring that "for them, the failure of the further struggle is clear (*the struggle, of course, with Germany, which collided with the damned Soviets*. - S.K.)", "surrendered to the German army" in the person of Lieutenant Bulk, representative of the commission of prisoners of war.

Balk accepted the "amusing" "surrender", issued a comically high-flown "order", and German prisoners, hastily armed by the rebels themselves, locked up the surrendered headquarters in the theater building and surrounded him with their guard. As

you can see, Balk did not help the Soviet government, but its enemies. Of course, the provocation of the Socialist-Revolutionaries had two goals: to save ourselves and to try to create a conflict that complicates our relations with the Germans. But this whole tragicomic story ended simply: the Emergency Headquarters of the Yaroslavl Front entered into short negotiations with Balk, in as a result of which, as the report of the Cheka reported, "the Austro-German prisoners laid down their arms, and the theater with the headquarters of the White Guards found itself in our hands."

And here is what he wrote in the summer of 1918 in a memorandum addressed to the Kaiser, allegedly Lenin's "patron" General Ludendorff: "If we do not launch an offensive (*on Russia*. - S.K.), then the situation will remain unclear. We may inflict on the Bolsheviks a mortal blow and strengthen our internal political position. Simple and direct...

There WAS, of course, in Germany far-sighted people who understood that the Bolsheviks, precisely as a potentially *national* Russian force, cannot be objectively hostile to Germany as such. In the same

"Red Book of the Cheka" there is an interesting testimony of one of the leaders underground "National Center" Professor Sergei Andreevich Kotlyarevsky. Arrested at the end of the civil war, in 1920, he described recent events and Here's the picture he got...

At one time, the Russian elite, which was not in power, tried to flirt with the Germans and directly asked what the price of occupation would be if, in the name of liberation from Bolsheviks, liberal professors will summon German troops to Russia? German the representative, the embassy adviser close to Ambassador Mirbach, Dr. Ritzler, frankly declared: "We will not give this performance to the Russian

bourgeoisie." Why? In May 1918, Ritzler himself explained this to Kotlyarevsky. They met in private house, and their conversation turned out to be easy, frank. Ritzler, son famous Bavarian historian and the historian himself, was familiar with Kotlyarevsky from Munich, where Kotlyarevsky once worked on his dissertation and visited the Ritzlers' house.

"The hopes of the Russians for our intervention are illusory," disappointed Kotlyarevsky Ritzler.

- ??! ...

- The Soviet government, after all, made peace with us. Moreover, Germany is not sympathizes with your right-wing circles. Of course, the "war party" and Ludendorff himself are in relation to the Bolsheviks irreconcilably, but there are also objective considerations ...

- Which? - immediately threw up Kotlyarevsky, - After all, earlier you supported the most reaction circles! "You

shouldn't think so," Ritzler disagreed, "your reaction was kept afloat billions of French loans. And what can change now? "A lot," Kotlyarevsky tried to object.

"No, no," Ritzler laughed, "the Cadets are all infected with hatred for Germany and are under the influence of the British. And even if Germany wanted to overthrow Soviet power, then to work for the transfer of power into the hands of the Cadets means to work for Entente. Why is this for us?

The German paused and added:

"The Left, by the way—I'm talking about the Socialist-Revolutionaries—are also hostile to Germany." No, then the government that you have is the most acceptable both for Russia itself and for us...

Ritzler's conversation with Kotlyarevsky took place shortly before the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries' assassination attempt on Mirbach and the Left SR rebellion. So in assessing the Socialist-Revolutionary sentiments, Ritzler does not I was mistaken, as in my assessment of the political aspirations of the Cadets. Professor Milyukov in Kyiv tried, however, to organize a broad German intervention in Great Russia, however it was an attempt to establish only a temporary, forced alliance with the "Teutons" against "Sovdepiya".

Although it is significant that, according to Kotlyarevsky, even in the professorial the liberal environment, which had not previously accepted the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, had an understanding that it was the only way out for Russia at that time. In Kaiser Germany,

which was about to collapse, views like those Ritzler expressed, were not, alas, dominant. However, even sane Germany was inclined to a certain loyal restraint in relation to the Soviet power, not because this power was "pro-German", but because only this power correctly understood what Russia needed from the outside world.

And we needed, firstly, peace, and secondly, the widest possible economic ties with the Germans.

In a conversation with Kotlyarevsky, Ritzler admitted that an independent Ukraine is more needed Austria-Hungary than Germany.

- And what follows from this? Sergey Andreevich asked. - Well, in any case, after the end of the war, the Brest-Litovsk peace will be, it is necessary be revised in the spirit of long-term good neighborly relations between Germany and Russia. We need to strengthen their economic and cultural side right now...

And soon, Mirbach was killed by the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries. July 14, 1918 at 11 p.m. Dr. Ritzler, acting as a German diplomatic representative, visited the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Chicherin, and informed him of the contents of only that of a telegram received from Berlin. The German government instructed Rietzler "to ask for the consent of the Russian government to the admission of a battalion of German soldiers in military uniform to guard the German embassy and the speedy delivery of these soldiers to Moscow". Ritzler assured that, they say, "any occupation goals are far from the German government."

The battalion is not a division, but not a platoon either. Yes, even a platoon! This was the point beyond which to retreat meant losing the national character of Soviet power. That is why the next day, July 15, Lenin meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee read out the draft government statement, which said: "In no case and under no circumstances can we satisfy such a desire we can, because this would objectively be the beginning of the occupation of Russia by foreign troops.

We would be forced to respond to such a step ... with increased mobilization, an appeal without exception, all adult workers and peasants to armed resistance ... The war became would then be a fatal, but unconditional and unconditional necessity, and this revolutionary the workers and peasants of Russia will wage the war hand in hand with the Soviet government to the last breath."

The All-Russian Central Executive Committee approved this statement of the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR unanimously. Of course, there was a risk, the Germans could launch an offensive ... But we had nowhere to retreat: we had Moscow. The Germans realized that any pressure would bring a result opposite to what was desired. And while everything remained as it was. Four

months have passed ... And at the very first meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the sixth convocation, on November 13 1918, Sverdlov, in the silence of a frozen hall, read out a resolution: "The All-Russian Central Executive Committee hereby solemnly declares that the terms of peace with Germany, signed in Brest on March 3, 1918, have become invalid and values. Treaty of Brest-Litovsk <...> in general and in all paragraphs is declared destroyed.

The Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic proposes to the fraternal peoples of Germany and the former Austria-Hungary <...> start immediately settlement of issues related to the destruction of the Brest Treaty"...

At the same meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, it was decided to send as a gift to the workers of Germany two bread route. Then it

turned out like this ... When the trains arrived at the Verzhbolovo border station, representatives of the German Soldiers' Council began to hesitate: they say, we have no instructions, bread until we can accept. And in the morning, a member of the new German government, Hugo Haase, transmitted by direct wire to the German Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in Moscow:

"I ask you to inform the Russian government of the following. On the issue of proposed shipment of flour, the cabinet instructed him to express to him a deeply felt Gratitude of the German People's Government. We appreciate this sacrifice the more we and the whole world are aware of the acute need endured by the population in St. Petersburg and Moscow. Fortunately, as a result of the steps we have taken with President Wilson opened up for us the possibility of obtaining food supplies from across the ocean. We are therefore in able to refuse the generous offer of the Russian government for the time being.

Fifty carloads of bread is a drop in the ocean of needs for both Russia and Germany. Of course, this was just a gesture on our part. But Berlin's refusal was also a gesture - quite significant -: the "leaders" of the German revolution tried to dissociate themselves from kinship with Russian revolution.

But Germany was then painted thickly in red, like the rest of the conquered European powers. And although by 1919 the Entente had also fallen on Russia, fermentation began in the Anglo-French interventionist forces. A little time will pass, and, as already mentioned, the Odessa squadron of the French smoke in the direction of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles - away from Russia and from the "sin Bolshevism."

Even the British did not feel at ease in the new world where the Soviet Russia. Even though the English elite worked hard to create that "empire stomach," which Cecile Rhodes longed for. Five years before the war, wealthy England ventured into major social reforms: insurance against illness, unemployment, unsecured old age. Under the Old Men's Insurance Act, every English a citizen over 70 years of age who had no means of subsistence was entitled to 5 state shillings per week. The money is small, but they saved me from starvation.

In the world of that time, this was a new, "epoch-making" phenomenon. But with the advent of the worker-peasant state, the "bold" reforms immediately somehow faded. Yes, and money such "good deeds" were largely spent during the war, and after the war had to pay war debts.

England was getting poorer, the public atmosphere was heating up, people began to walk around the country powerful social whirlwinds...

Whirlwinds WALKED, but already diplomatic, and through the halls with those who had gathered in Versailles "peacekeepers". On January 30, 1919, Colonel House wrote in his diary: "It seemed that

everything went to waste. The President was angry, Lloyd George was angry, and Clemenceau was angry too. For the first time, the president lost his temper when negotiating with them ...".

Let's not be gullible: House's Diaries were written with the obligatory publishing them. So quite often the goal of their author was not to fix the genuine state of affairs, and the creation of the necessary Golden International (that is, distorted to unrecognizable) ideas about the true motives, plans and decisions of the supranational Elites.

Although through the colonel's "smoke screens" - no worse than those who are so masterfully got the hang of putting during the war the Minister of the Navy of England Churchill - sometimes showed through and the contours of

truth. And this time, House's diary entry reflected what was clearly taking place, that is, squabble. Yes, and could it not be among the predators, ready to pour their own - like Theodore Roosevelt and the cannon king Schneider, who lost his son in the war, or his own - as magnates on the Lusitania, blood for the sake of "golden"

benefits? The benefits of their

own and their class. House's Diaries were published in the second half of the thirties, and in those times when the "colonel" was still busy with practical politics, America wanted to make the League of Nations the pivot of the future world.

Naturally, the "American" League was conceived as a lever of America's dominance in around the world, including, of course, Europe.

The English project, however, saw the League as an equal bloc of large imperialist states ensuring the status quo in terms of colonies and spheres influence. Here, too, everything was clear: this was how British colonial power was preserved.

The position of France was different. In the war, she lost every tenth man, fertile lands were sown with fragments. And the French at the conference were worried about things more specific and close: the robbery of Germany, the return of Alsace and Lorraine, reparations and ... the "Russian question".

Marshal Foch shouted over and over

again: - Monsieur, if we do not put an end to the "Bolshevik danger", we will lose the war! - How else is that? - "colleagues" were surprised. -

Germany is defeated, but what if she, in her own interests, regulates relations with Russia or, God forbid, she herself will become a victim of Bolshevism, - the marshal explained.

He was even ready to cooperate with Germany in the fight against the Russian Bolshevism after the signing of the preliminary agreement and believed that such an option can be very valuable.

Bourgeois France remained true to itself: to prevent the rapprochement of Russians and Germans at any cost - and was ready for this even to lose part of the production during its upcoming carve-up.

The French were also concerned about creating Poland as a "barrier between Germany and Russia", according to Clemenceau. Raised on duplicity, Clemenceau lied here too. Poland was planning as a barrier, but as a barrier for a new war, which will be raised in due time.

And, PLEASE, the topic of "Versailles" Poland should be discussed separately ... In the autumn of 1916, from the occupied lands of Russian Poland, Kaiser's Germany created the first "independent" Polish kingdom in the modern history of the world. After defeat of the Reich, it went into oblivion, and it was replaced by Poland, called to life already the Entente. From the German version, the allied version was inherited only quotation marks for the word "independent".

The meaning of "Polish statehood" in the version of Versailles was different than in German version. Now Danzig was torn away from Germany, and the Polish corridor" to the Baltic Sea, a hundred kilometers wide cut off from Germany East Prussia.

The borders with Poland were artificially divided by economically unified regions of Germany and cut off vast areas with a purely German population from their homeland. IN militarily, the border of Germany with Poland was opened for hundreds of kilometers.

The ideological considerations of "Polish-Soviet friendship" were formed in the USSR completely distorted and inadequate perception of Poland. However, the Polish aspect problems of European stability must be considered primarily in the light of its possible destabilizing potential, because Poland organically cannot be a stabilizing factor. And smart

people have always understood this! On

March 25, 1919, British Prime Minister Lloyd George sent the participants Paris "peace" conference memorandum entitled "Some considerations for the information of the conference participants, before the final conditions" - the so-called "document from Fontainebleau".

Lloyd George wrote: "If in the end Germany feels that with her treated unfairly in the peace treaty of 1919, it will find means to obtain compensation from its conquerors... The maintenance of the peace will... depend on the elimination of all causes for irritation, which constantly raises the spirit of patriotism; it will depend on justice, on the consciousness that people act honestly in their the desire to compensate for the losses ... The injustice and arrogance shown in the hour triumph will never be forgotten or forgiven. For these

reasons, I strongly oppose the transfer of a large number of Germans from Germany under the rule of other states ... I cannot help but see the reason future war is that the German people, who have shown themselves sufficiently as one of the the most energetic and powerful nations of the world, will be surrounded by a number of small states. The peoples of many of them (*Lloyd George could have said bluntly: the Czech Republic and Poland. - S.K.)* have never before been able to create stable governments for themselves, and now in each of these states will be hit by a mass of Germans demanding reunification with their homeland. Proposal of the commission on Polish affairs to transfer 2,100 thousand Germans under power people of a different religion, a people who throughout their history have not been able to prove that they are capable of stable self-government, in my opinion, sooner or later lead to a new war in Eastern Europe.

They did not listen to Lloyd George, and as a result of the redistribution of the territory of Germany after the First World War, decreased by 13 percent due to the generous Entente gifts to Poland. Ten

years after the Fontainebleau Memorandum appeared, some analysts in England stated that the creation of the Polish corridor with the withdrawal of Poland to the sea is "one of the worst known crimes against civilization in history. No more and no more less! The Englishman Follik regarded the actual transfer of Danzig to Poland as the second the heaviest crime. And

here is an assessment of Poland in the thirties, owned by an American journalist who is well acquainted with the subject: "It is quite possible to insure a gunpowder factory if safety rules are observed, however, to insure a factory full of crazy,

a bit dangerous...

So, Poland is a gunpowder factory full of crazy people... I didn't say that, dear reader, but an American. Well, from the outside, from across the ocean, you probably know better ... I'll add only that it would not hurt to listen to this long-standing assessment of today's Europe ... more than in Europe, the political abilities of the Polish "tops" were able to assess impartial even those who patronized them. Churchill himself during World War II war, in October 1944, enraged by the stupid unwillingness of the emigrant "premier" of Poland Mikolajczyk to recognize the future borders of Poland with the USSR along the ethnic "line Curzon," he threw to the London Poles: "You are not the government, you are blinded people ... you only have base self-interest on your mind ... Your argument is,

simply put, a criminal attempt to disrupt the agreement between the allies ... you should be put in a hospital for the insane." Returning

to the preliminary European alignment, outlined Versailles "peacekeepers" at the end of the First World War, I will inform you that Austrian Germans - contrary to the Entente's loudly proclaimed "right of nations to self-determination" - reunification with the German Germans was categorically forbidden, although the Constituent Assembly in Vienna *unanimously* voted for the Anschluss, that is annexation of Austria to Germany! The

Austrian Sudetenland, inhabited almost exclusively by Germans, was transferred - again contrary to the proclaimed principles of ethnicity homogeneity - into the composition of the newly formed "Versailles" Czechoslovakia.

In addition to the "Polish" "innovations", the transfer of millions of Germans under the rule of the Czechs programmed the future conflict in the center of Europe with the accuracy of a skillful navigator laying on the sea chart.

IN THE SPRING of 1919, of course, a new European war was still far away. April 30 the German delegation arrived in Paris, and on May 7 it was summoned to Versailles for a meeting conferences. Clemenceau, small and yellow, like a desiccated human fetus (*comparison Harold Nicholson, who observed the Frenchman with his own eyes. - S.K.*), told them: "An hour reckoning has come "...

While the speech of the French prime minister was being translated, the secretary of the conference handed defeated thick book - the conditions of the world. Four hundred and forty articles on two hundred and nine pages ...

Having leafed through them, Brockdorff-Rantzau said in a response speech: "Gentlemen! We are required to admit that we are the only culprits of the war. Similar recognition in my mouth would be a lie. Germany recognizes the injustice committed by her relation to Belgium. But only! We were not the only ones wrong. And it is safe to correct these errors can be based on 14 points of peace, from which Germany proceeded, agreeing to truce"...

Wilson's "Peace Points" really interpreted only territorial and national problems in the spirit of education in Europe only of those states that were would be nationally holistic with broad autonomy of national minorities. However, at Versailles, Germany was not only "hung with all the dogs", but also stupidly corned its territory, heaped exorbitant reparations ...

The conditions of the thick "book of the world" turned out to be heavier than the entire world printing products of that era. Difficult mutual negotiations began. The Germans balked at Demonstrations took place in Berlin, President Ebert and Minister Scheidemann made speeches from the balcony, reaching out to the crowd. "Let their hands wither before they sign such peace treaty," Scheidemann conjured.

Germany has declared national mourning for a week. But before the hands of the German leaders withered, Saturday, June 28, 1919, arrived. In the Hall of Mirrors of Versailles, Clemenceau sat under a heavy canopy with stucco gilded inscription: "Le roi gouverne par lui-meme" ("The king rules by his own will").

With a ribbon over his shoulder, this embryo of either a man or a future war creaked: "Let the Germans in!". The

sound of footsteps in silence, and then again the voice of Clemenceau: "Monsieur, the meeting is open!". A few more phrases filtered through teeth, and the Germans are led to the table where contract. Dr. Müller signs it to the sound of an artillery salute. "The meeting is over,"

Clemenceau spits. The Germans are taken away.

They finally legally capitulated to the "allied and United Powers": the United States of North America, the British empire, France, Italy and Japan, as well as Belgium that joined them,

Bolivia, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Gejas, Honduras, Liberia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbo-Croat-Slovenia, Siam, Czechoslovakia and Uruguay. China did not sign the Treaty of Versailles for good reason: the right to

It was not he who received the Shandong province, but

Japan. The United States, Ecuador and Guedjas signed the treaty, but did not ratify it, each in its own way considerations.

The United States concluded a separate treaty with Germany in 1921, not much different from Versailles, but I don't know how it was with Gedjas ... One

thing is certain - the blood of Samsonov's soldiers, who ensured the "miracle on the Marne", the blood "Brusilov" breakthrough, which provided subsequent "miracles", like the sweat of Russians craftsmen and peasants did not count.

The Entente was not up to it - it was necessary to help Denikin and Kolchak.

ACCORDING to the assurances of the allies, the basis of the future Versailles system should have been lay down 14 points of the peace terms of President Wilson. They sounded, as we know, beautifully - the overseas uncle was supposed to look kind and fair. AND indeed, much better: a world without annexations, equality of nations, open diplomacy, freedom of the seas ... However, the

Germans were deceived - the agreement they signed had nothing to do with promises Wilson did not. In Paris, the last act of a grandiose performance was played: at the beginning it was necessary to throw the Wilsonian "bait" to the Germans, then, when they stopped to fight, this bait was pulled from them with blood. And in order for America to retain the face (more precisely, the mask) of a freedom lover, the "disagreements" of the allies at the Paris Conference were inflated for the public to irreconcilable proportions. Wilson allegedly advocated future world "brotherhood and friendship", and the roles of "beech" were assigned to others: in part - to Lloyd George and wholly — Clemenceau.

In the end, the "peace" came out in such a way that Lenin, looking at it from the side, remarked: "The war, through the Treaty of Versailles, imposed such conditions that the advanced peoples found themselves in a position of colonial dependence, poverty, hunger, ruin and lack of rights, because for many generations they are bound by an agreement and placed in such conditions in which no civilized people have lived. This is an unheard-of, predatory world that tens of millions of people, including the most civilized, puts them in the position of slaves.

Lenin did not exaggerate - Germany fell into real slavery. Even Churchill admitted: "The economic clauses of the treaty were vicious and stupid to the point of becoming manifestly meaningless."

At the same time, exclusively to Germany - and not even to the leadership, but to German the people - single-handedly assigned all the official responsibility for the war. True, and the Kaiser was sanctioned with the charge of "the highest insult international morality and the sacred power of treaties. The

German commanders Hindenburg, Ludendorff, the German industrialists Thyssen, Krupp and others were declared war criminals. So it is, but it turned out that Du Ponts, Basil-Zakharovs, Morgans, Frenchies, Tafts, Stimsons, Rockefellers, Gepners, Brodskys, Ryabushinskys, Putilovs, Clemenceaus, Churchills, Rothschilds, Grays, Sukhomlinovs, Baruchs, Poincare and Wilsons had nothing to do with it ... Yes, the Kaiser in case

of victory counted on major annexations and economic benefits. On the pan-German maps, the desired borders of the "Deutsches Kaiserreich" stretched from Calais to the Gulf of Finland and even captured England as a vassal territory. But it was, firstly, "beer" extremism, not supported by resources and real government policy. And, secondly, the Germans, unlike America, do not pretended to be the liberators of the European peoples. They imperiously demanded that with them

were considered...

Knowing how to work, they were ready to compete hard with the whole world in economic competition, and since they were not allowed to, they wanted to achieve their rights with an armed hand. Well, with such a people it really was more true not to fight, but to make peace. The Golden International chose war.

WRITING like this, the author is by no means inclined to justify the Germans, in their national there are enough unworthy traits in the character, but in whose national character are they not?

Nor am I inclined to accept the dubious principle "To understand is to forgive." That, what cannot be forgiven cannot be forgiven.

However, a correct understanding of the past provides us with a correct line in the present ... And if there is no desire to understand, even an encyclopedic erudition ... I mean the view of our famous historian-academician E. V. Tarle ... Evgeny Viktorovich came from a

well-to-do intelligent bourgeois environment. Born in 1875, in 1903 he became a Privatdozent, and in 1917 a professor at St. Petersburg University. If October 1917 did not happen, it would still become would be a large figure in historical science: for this he had everything ... But as a historian and as a public figure, he was formed as a liberal. After October, Tarle

began to work as a Marxist historian, and, most likely, quite sincerely. But even before the Marxist method of studying history became in Russia normative, and after that Tarle, in his *spiritual* predilections, has always been, I repeat, a Russian liberal. French Marianne-"Freedom" and correct English "gentlemen" were closer to him than "stupid Prussian soldier". Soft-lordly nature Evgenia Viktorovich was deeply hostile to the "Prussian drill". And therefore

Tarle organically could not and did not want to recognize as an immutable scientific conclusion and declare as a civil position that in relation to Germany, Russia always There was only one reasonable way: to be friends with her. Otherwise, I had to fight with it, violating Russia's interests.

In relation to all other powers, there was no rigidity of choice ... With all the rest could (and should, of course, have been) friends; but if they climbed on the rampage, with they could and should have been fought, or simply "bracketed" and taken into account insofar as because...

And unconditional peace with Germany was a value in itself! Peace with Germany is an indispensable condition for the powerful development of Russia. That's what should have been an imperative Russian foreign policy of the XX century.

Alas, unconditional friendship with Germany was not a path for Tarle and others, similar to those who thought like him... And Tarle's like-minded people had, say, such an influential person as the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the USSR Litvinov, who for a good ten years had driven a wedge into Soviet-German relations and almost openly adhered to the Anglo-Saxon orientation until his retirement in 1939. That is why, in

1938, in the journal Historian-Marxist, Tarle could write: "Now that Soviet science is eliminating the consequences of the systematic falsification of history carried out by Pokrovsky's "school", it's time to finish off completely and with one of the completely already ugly in their obvious mendacity, one of the most erroneous in scientific most harmful in relation to the political ideas put into play Pokrovsky ... We are talking about the notorious question regarding "guilt" in the world war.

Tirelessly (*Pokrovsky*. - S.K.), the Entente was denounced with fervor and enthusiasm. And since In fact, the Entente, too (*this "also ..."* Tarle looks simply *incomparable!* - S.K.) was guilty and very guilty, then the articles of the "school" were acquired for the naive reader extremely convincing appearance, it was only necessary, denouncing the Entente ... to mutter about

Germany ... The animal fangs of German imperialism in 1912, and in 1913, and in 1914 did not one historian has no right to embarrassingly cover from the eyes of posterity "...

That's what it means *not to love* ! The historian Tarle completely forgot that by the beginning of the First world war, if any imperialism had animal fangs, periodically letting them in move, so it's Anglo-Saxon.

The destruction of the North American Indians ... Millions of black slaves transported from Africa to the States, and millions of the same slaves who were not brought to the States and go to feed the sharks ...

The brutal, subtly vile execution by the Britons of the rebellious sepoys tied to cannon muzzles ... Atrocities of the Boer War ... Atrocities that for decades the darkness of the night did not hide for a second, since the British Empire "never set the sun "...

That's how things were in reality! Germany is not colonial conquests neglected, but here it would be appropriate to use the word "too" ... In 1926,

Tarle signed a letter to the old Bolshevik-Leninist, historian Mikhail Nikolaevich Pokrovsky: "Devoted to you, Evg. Tarle", and at the end of 1932 boasts in a letter to T. L. Shchepkina-Kupernik of an "archaic" review just deceased Pokrovsky about his work "Germinal and Prairial". His clearly pro-

French and negative to the Germans book "Europe in the era imperialism" Tarle freely published during the life of Pokrovsky, in 1927 ... And Pokrovsky Tarle "under the walnut" for her did not

butcher. But 1938 is the time of diplomatic and foreign policy power Anglophile and Germanophobic Litvinov, and Tarle smashes the late Pokrovsky in such expressions: "Pokrovsky, heading a number of historical institutions, could easily spread their anti-scientific and anti-Leninist views, not allowing them to be criticized by side of the scientific community. At one

time, the "anti-Leninist" Pokrovsky edited Lenin's "Imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism" at the request of Lenin, although in the views on the "German question" with Lenin once broke up. During the Brest Peace, Pokrovsky publicly insisted on an immediate offensive against the Germans, and Lenin criticized him.

That is, it was difficult to write down Pokrovsky as a Germanophile, and he just tried be historically accurate when he stated: "From the beginning of the world crisis of 1911-1914 the military-political situation of its outcome was predetermined by military agreements and plans of the general staffs of France and Russia. It was

so! Without a real, documented and publicly executed and practically working Franco-Russian alliance (and only without it!) to unleash the necessary For the Golden International, a big and long European war would simply be impossible! In its initial message,

the European war was programmed only by the Franco-Russian tandem, where the leader, France, was eager to take revenge for the Sedan, and Pokrovsky was right here three times - as a historian, as a politician and as a true, conscious patriot Russia.

And then - after analyzing the possible prospects for Germany and Russia in a peaceful development of events - the Franco-Russian alliance was used by overseas and supranational planners of future US dominance for the ultimate the formation of an anti-German Entente, designed to ensure the outbreak of war.

Tarle, trying to prove the opposite, sometimes looked just ridiculous. For example, Pokrovsky directly pointed to the Serbian origins of the assassination attempt in Sarajevo. Tarle denied them. on the grounds that, they say, "the direct participation of Serbian authorities in a

conspiracy. Pokrovsky reasonably remarked: "Of course, the order signed by Pasic (*Serbian premiere*. - S. K.) cannot be found in any archives to kill Franz Ferdinand.

"From what? Tarle asked with a funny "naivete" at fifty-three, and continued: "Perhaps someday there will be documents about this ... Then we will speak categorically "... It is

unlikely that Evgeny Viktorovich himself believed in his own words and sincerely admitted at least for a moment that *such* orders are trusted on paper. Another thing is a historical lie. Already here no problem, the paper will endure it. And his 1938 accusations against Pokrovsky Tarle built on the basis of those just published then in the USA ... "The Diaries of Colonel House", from which it allegedly followed that "the heaviest share of responsibility for unleashing world war lies primarily and most of all on Germany. Who is House, we

know. Having actively participated in the preparations for one world war, he now worked with his alleged diaries to prepare for the second world war, which

The Golden International was conceived according to the same scheme: "Germany against Russia."

So Tarle, believing in 1938 the alleged revelations of House, just fell for provocation, both anti-German and anti-Russian. For, as in a quarter of a century before that, Russia and Germany quarreled in order to then push their foreheads together.

The Prosperous Supranational Elite has accumulated considerable experience here. not without reason Pokrovsky wrote in 1928: "The undisputed victory of the Entente (*meaning the victory in dispute over who de "started first."* - S.K.) was bought by a whole sea of newspaper lies, forgeries and forgeries."

House's "diaries" were a historical forgery;
Treaty of Versailles.

However, in 1919, no one in Entente Europe would even think of such a hint dared ... The only judge here was Clemenceau, and he pointed with an inexorable finger exclusively on the Boches, on Berlin and on the Kaiser ...

HOT Entente tried so hard to blame everything on Wilhelm that in Versailles the treaty even had a special clause on the extradition of the former Kaiser of the Entente for trial. But immediately the "judges" realized that such a trial would prove something good: the imperialist war did not arise as a result of the will of one "half-crazy monarch", but as an inevitable feature of the existence of the entire system of capitalism, where American greedy hypocrisy and Anglo-French colonial vampirism looked no less (if not more) disgusting than German militarism.

In fact, Wilhelm himself, already in exile in Holland, sorted out the problem quite thoroughly, and one of the chapters of his memoirs is called: "The question of the perpetrators war "...

The former Kaiser noted that before the war the general situation of the German Empire was brilliant, but that is why "her position became more and more difficult in the international arena"... Wilhelm directly pointed out that the German "peaceful conquest a significant part of the world market corresponded to the zeal and success of the Germans and should belonged to them by justice", however, this did not suit England, why she, "not being able to compete" with Germany peacefully, had to "use violence" ... "In the world market, we still moved forward in accordance with our plans, and in

We had nothing to complain about in this regard," Wilhelm continued and concluded. "Why did we have to stake the fruits of our peaceful work?" Of course, there was not without cunning

here, but not without truth either ... It is curious that the former

Kaiser did not understand the essence, that is, that he and
In the end, it was the Yankees who "threw" Germany. Wilhelm did not blame America for her role in the First World War, on the contrary, he was sure that America was just used the opportunities presented to her ("carried out her profitable business"), and wrote: "One cannot reproach any state for its sovereign decision on war and peace, since this decision is not in conflict with firm treaties."

Nevertheless, Wilhelm admitted: "It must still be noted that John Kenneth Turner, in his book "Shall it be again", on the basis of extensive materials, proves that all the reasons given by Wilson for America's entry into the war do not correspond to reality and that Wilson acted solely in the interests of influential the highest financial circles of Wall Street.

America benefited greatly from the World War: it concentrated almost 60% of the world's gold reserves, and now it is no longer the English pound, but the American dollar determines the exchange rate throughout the world "...

The Kaiser was and remains the largest owner, and therefore it is very much to expose other owners, albeit scorched him, Wilhelm could not get away with it ... But the implementation by America of its "profitable business" in Europe by the hands of the Entente did not become this more attractive and worthy. Both America and the Anglo-French Entente looked, I repeat, disgusting, and moreover - cannibalistic ...

What was the cost of one "Versailles" statement by Clemenceau that he lives in Germany "an extra twenty million people"! Can only compete with such a statement? that the message published during the war of the "solid", "objective" London The Times, about the "factory for the processing of human corpses, from which the Germans extract various substances for military purposes and even food products in the form of surrogates meat"... The subtext was obvious: is it worth it to stand on ceremony with such monsters?

They did not stand on ceremony with the defeated Germans - we will soon see this ... Alas, The creators of Versailles found like-minded people in Russia after decades. Historical novelist Valentin Pikul shrugged his shoulders: "It would seem that the Germans who suffered defeat, only rejoice at the conditions of peace, because the integrity of Germany did not suffer (*although she also suffered.* - S.K.), the winners generously (*wow!* - S.K.) saved unity of country and nation. But Germany roared like a bull being castrated." Pikul's "logic" exactly

corresponded to the views of Gogol's Ivan Ivanovich, who, after asking a poor old woman if she wanted bread and meat, "generously" concluded: "Well, go with God. Why are you standing? After all, I'm not you beat...".

N-yes...

Chapter 2. Versailles sentence: "And in the third generation you will pull webbing "...

UNLIKE Gogol's "sky gods", the Germans were not only mocked. They are also beaten. And they beat ordinary Germans. The fact that Germany was deprived of significant territories was still half the trouble, although Alsace and Lorraine, again torn away from Germany, were rather German than French lands. Bismarck was once inclined to think transfer part of this disputed territory to a third party - Switzerland, and even a brief a look at the problem of Alsace and Lorraine convinces us that the meaning of the idea of "iron chancellor" was.

Both France and Germany did not cope well with the "Alsatian question". Before the middle of the 17th century, until the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, these provinces were part of Germany. Then they were taken over by France, but even two hundred years later, in the middle of the 19th century, German was the native language for 85 percent of the population. And the villagers in general did not know French even in the twenties of the twentieth century - already after Alsace and Lorraine again became part of France. The

French from century to century showed themselves to be a bad "big brother". Violent Frenchization was so severe that in 1869, shortly before the Franco-Prussian war, in Strasbourg had to introduce martial law.

The Germans, however, having annexed the ancient Lorraine, behaved no better and began enhanced Germanization. At that time, 400 thousand people moved to France. IN in the German Reichstag, the Alsatians received 15 seats, and so, in the very first elections, all fifteen were won by the party opposed to the German annexation. But after twenty years, in 1890, she no longer had success, despite the fact that France had a lot of money spent on artificial incitement of passions.

Even academician Tarle admitted: "Actually, there was not a single class of the population in Alsace-Lorraine, which would definitely aspire to join France. The working class did not show the slightest separatist inclinations; large trading the bourgeoisie and the financial world have developed close ties with the German internal market.

That is, the love of the Alsatians for the good old Gaul burned with a bright flame only on pages of Parisian newspapers. However, the winners unconditionally claimed the "return French provinces captured by the Teutons. At the same time, Clemenceau referred to "the rejoicing of the people", with which the French troops were greeted, and stated that "The plebiscite has taken

place." Bonnets instead of referendum ballots - this was in the practice of the people expression of will with something new. And I don't know how many of them took off into the air there, but inexorable figures prove that the Alsatians of the French "liberators" welcomed mainly in German. And the French "homeland" to new citizens was still unkind. They were discriminated against, Alsatian recruits were sent serve exclusively in the colony with the most rotten climate. Now the flow

of forced migrants has already flowed to Germany. Accordingly, the Alsatian autonomists won both the parliamentary elections of 1928 and municipal 1929. The best option *for the population* would be really ensuring broad autonomy for Alsace-Lorraine within Germany, but France does not allowed this even theoretically. Very rich, very tasty were these territorial chunks. In other

words, about any genuine right of peoples to choose their fate as a result of "Versailles" zeal was out of the question. Let's say Germany was stripped of all its former colonies, however, did not liberate their peoples, but simply changed their

owners. As for almost all other European lands departing from Germany, their inhabited predominantly by Germans. Of the 327,000 inhabitants of Danzig, there were 317,000 of them. Memel, "donated" by the allies to "remake" Lithuania, also belonged to purely

German cities.

GERMANY was actually disarmed: the fleet was reduced to nothing, the army was reduced to only hundreds of thousands of people (96 thousand soldiers and 4 thousand officers). In the armed forces it was forbidden to have armored troops, aviation and heavy artillery.

130 thousand machine guns, 31 thousand mortars, 60 thousand guns were handed over and destroyed and trunks, almost 30 thousand carriages, 16 thousand aircraft and 27 thousand aircraft engines.

Germany was confiscated 80,000 weapons molds because it was forbidden to weapons production. The

fact that the army and navy were almost destroyed did not take away oil from German children. But oil was exported to the allies in tens of thousands of tons.

France and Belgium took 371 thousand heads of cattle from the Germans, of which 140 thousand dairy cows. And, depriving German children and the wounded in hospitals of milk, the French and The Belgians were actually engaged in genocide.

Until May 1, 1921, Germany had to pay 20 billion gold marks in gold, to hand over half of the cash in dyes, all the large merchant ships, half of the medium ships, a quarter of the fishing ships, and a fifth of the river fleet. On what to fish and carry

grain? For reparations, 150 thousand freight wagons were selected, 10 thousand wagons passenger and 5 thousand locomotives.

France seized the Ruhr economically, and the Germans were obliged to pay reparations supply France with 140 million tons of coal, Belgium - 80 million, Italy - 77 million.

The Germans were deprived of two-thirds of their coal wealth, four-fifths of their chemical power. They were deprived of a food production base, and indeed of everything that could appeal Entente ...

The extent to which the hands of the German people were twisted by the Versailles "rope" was seen not only in the rejection of the purely German Danzig from the Reich and the creation of the Polish The corridor of discord. In the manner of rapists, the allies also "resolved" the Upper Silesian question, which was a taboo subject in the USSR. The Poles looked very unattractive in this "question". The story is worth telling. The historians of the Central Committee of the CPSU

attributed Upper Silesia to the "original Polish lands", although the last year of Polish possession of them is 1336th ... You can't say anything, the year is not close to the 20th and 21st centuries.

Before the First World War, out of 2,207,981 inhabitants of Upper Silesia, Poles, together with half-Germans and half-Poles were 1,169,340 people. That is half. But there were also richest deposits of coal, zinc and iron ore. Wilson and Clemenceau insisted on the transfer of these deposits to Poland, together with the people who were "attached" to them.

Lloyd George balked. But the

Germans resisted even more, and here even Big Capital gave in. Firstly, people are not courts, it's still more difficult to divide them ... The most fair way out was plebiscite. The Germans insisted on it, the Germans achieved it.

In the plebiscite zone, the authority of an international commission headed by French - General Le-Ron. The Polish commissar Korfantoy was also circling there. To the zone aggressive Poles poured in, oppressing the Germans in every possible way. Fascist Poles supported by the French, the "democratic" people. Terror

flourished in the zone - not German, but Polish. Korfantogo organized it, not sparing effort, time and money. The Germans burned their houses, they were threatened with death.

The very same vote on March 20, 1921 passed quietly and ended in full German victory: 707,393 votes were cast for Germany and 479,365 votes for Poland.

As you can see, even many adult Poles wanted to live in Germany. Allied The Council of Ambassadors "graciously" gave Weimar Germany two-thirds of Silesia, and Poland -

third. But *what* third? Germany lost, and Poland acquired 95 percent of the reserves Silesian coal, 49 out of 61 anthracite mines, all 12 iron mines, 11 out of 16 zinc and lead mines, 23 out of 37 blast furnaces. Germany lost 18 percent national coal mining and seventy zinc. Shredded not only the

national wealth of Germany, but also the German nation. Stupid, ignorant, indifferent. What is Silesia! Here at least the Germans managed to defend something. A here's what happened to the Bohemian Germans, stranded in a never-before-mapped world "Czechoslovak" state, created by the efforts of the Czech Freemasons Masaryk, Benes and their patrons ...

Back in America, Wilson declared to his entourage: - I intend to give Bohemia to Czechoslovakia. - And what are you going to do with the Germans living there? "But there are few of them. "More than three million for seven million Czechs. - Three millions? Wilson wondered. - Curious! Masaryk never told me about it reported.

Of course, Masaryk could not loudly admit that the Czechs have neither moral, nor historical, nor international legal grounds for inclusion in the "Czechoslovakia" areas of residence of the Sudeten Germans.

Now others explained this to Wilson, but the new information did not influenced, and the Germans were placed under the rule of the Czechs. Formerly Bohemian areas of the Sudetes with The German population bordered on Germany, but were part of Austria-Hungary. After war "patchwork empire" collapsed. The right to self-determination received from the Entente Hungarians, Poles, Czechs (but not Slovaks). But the Austrian Germans are allies of such a right deprived, despite the unanimous desire of those to reunite with the Germans German through the Anschluss.

This decision hit the Sudeten Germans especially hard: sometimes the Czech the border separated from each other children and fathers, brothers and sisters.

Wilson gave South Tyrol to Italy, because he did not know what was south of the pass Brenner lived Austrians of German blood.

This is how the "democracy crusade against the greedy" really ended. Huns". It is interesting how the President of the Federation of Human Rights and citizen Monsieur Ferdinand Buisson - the one who in 1914 declared that de "death duel between the religion of force and the religion of law"?

AS YOU SEE, after the First World War, World Capital squeezed the people of Germany firmly, turning a hardworking and diligent country with a great people into a semi-colony under the control of the conquerors. Moreover, they tried to squeeze the maximum out of Germany, including because the second potential source of post-war benefits, Russia, is out of the hands of "Shepherds" Lenin managed to take away. The RSFSR rejected all claims for tsarist loans and debts, refusing, by the way, to participate in reparations from Germany.

At the first moment, Germany was required to pay a total payment of 226 billion gold stamps for 42 years. Finally, the allies agreed on 132 billion for 66 years, that is, Germany was obliged to pay debts until 1985! Until 1985!!! As the Nazis rose to power, they released an impressive poster:

an old man, a man and the young man under the whip of the overseer rotates the gate, and on the poster it is written: "And in the third generation you will pull the strap "... If

not for Lenin and not for the socialist revolution, something similar would have awaited Russia, although it was not a defeated party, but a former ally of England and France according to "Entente cordiale", which in French meant, as we remember, "cordial consent "... Germany paid reparations, and Russia would have sat down to the West in a debt hole ...

But since the West did not succeed in the latter with Russia, there was nothing left but to recoup on Germany. They bounced back

on it, but first of all, not Clemenceau's France and not Britain Lloyd George, and directly the United States. And, oddly enough, the last fact was not always obvious even to knowledgeable contemporaries. So, in the USSR, even in 1928, some believed that the Versailles system "creates the conditions for hegemony French imperialism on the continent of Europe". In fact,

Versailles created all the conditions for the hegemony of imperialism American. And it was done so skillfully and deftly that America was in the shadow and even managed to create the impression that the Europeans bypass it and are not very obedient to it. Academician Tarle wrote: "The French (Clemenceau and Poincaré who stood behind him) only then had to reckon with Wilson when, in the disputes that arose, he took his side Lloyd George. But Lloyd George did not often and not very vigorously step on his side." And

even the capital Soviet "History of Diplomacy" was sure that: "As a result war and Versailles, the contradictions between the allies deepened even more. American monopolies were not satisfied with the results of the peace conference... Because of this, the Senate The United States, under pressure from the isolationists (*oh, those allegedly omnipotent "isolationists"!* - S.K.), refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles. The authors

of the fundamental Soviet diplomatic chronicle must have dug through mountains of archival documents, took into account the instructions of the Central Committee and applied the "Marxist" methodology. However, they did not take into account either the lascivious movements of Lloyd George's thick eyebrows, or the beaten Clemenceau's drooping mustache, nor the sardonic curve of Wilson's nervous, demanding lips. And the curve of the lips of the President of the United States determined everything in post-war Europe.

Incidentally, Senator Lodge, an "isolationist" and Wilson's most vocal opponent, is not abhorred to admit: "This is not isolationism, but the freedom to act as we believe necessary, not isolationism, but simply the unbound and unhampered freedom of the Great The powers decide for themselves which way to go.

To put it simply, America did not allow anyone to tell her, reserving the right indicate to everyone. The famous phrase of the automobile "king" Henry Ford is known: "I allow buyers to choose a car of any color, provided they choose black "... Approximately in this manner, America was" compliant "with the Europeans on Paris conference and after it, although outwardly everything looked decent ...

For example, in the "Archive of Colonel House" published in the United States, there are entries on this an account worthy of the pen of Dumas père ... For example, House wrote that in response to his question about how held a meeting with Clemenceau and Lloyd George, Wilson allegedly replied: "Brilliant, we dispersed on all issues.

In literary terms, this anecdote is really brilliant, but in historical its value is zero. The debtor disagrees with the creditor only to the extent that as long as the creditor allows him to do so or as long as it is beneficial to the creditor. But the lender now there was only one in the world - the States, all the rest in relation to them were debtors. In addition,

America now had both a powerful armed forces and a military industry, allowing, if necessary, to quickly build up military power.

YES, the US did not ratify the Treaty of Versailles. They did not enter the League with pomp Nations, "mercifully" joining it only in 1934, when America began to prepare the second edition of the world slaughter for the glory of profits and hegemony of America. But the authors of the manifesto Second Congress of the Third Communist International already in the summer of 1919 stated: "The ruling circles of the United States are trying, with the help of the League of Nations, to attach to with his golden chariot, the peoples of Europe and other parts of the world, securing over them administration from Washington. The League of Nations was to become, in essence, a world monopoly Yankee & Co.

The League of Nations became the United States without formal membership in it! European clients The United States, such as Winston Churchill, assured the whole world: "The League of Nations had scarcely been she was almost mortally wounded. The United States renounced the offspring President Wilson, and then his party and his political course were swept away by the victory Republicans in the 1920 presidential election." Churchill wrote

this in his History of the Second World War, and objectively he the opus was worth House's "diaries".

Wilson was not swept away by the Republicans - on September 25, 1919, he was paralyzed, and Wilson's personal defeat in the forthcoming elections was inevitable for this reason alone. However, even without such a circumstance, it was time for the US Elite to "change guard", which was done while the tasks of the "guard" remained unchanged. The political course of the United States was preserved even after the departure of Wilson, and it was a course towards establishing economic and political control over the European situation, and also to consolidate the emerging global leadership of the United States. And what were the literary "smoke screens" of Churchill, if the new US President Harding acted in accordance with the program of Wilson, who had previously stated: "We must finance the entire world, and those who finance the world should manage it"? This

phrase was the germ of the future plans of Dawes and Jung, which will be discussed later. said...

Amazing! The American Dawes was actively negotiating in Europe, preparing a new American disposition for Europe in the form of a plan later named after him, and Academician Tarle, in the April issue of the Annals for 1924, stated: "From non-European powers, only the United States is a serious figure, but the US government and the Republican Party, which has been dominant since the 1920 election the main principle of their foreign policy defiantly expose the beginning complete non-intervention in European affairs. Yes, and it would be surprising if it was different."

However, the situation was, of course, otherwise ...

Firstly, the United States was after the First World War not "serious", but the most serious value.

Secondly, the United States not only intervened more and more aggressively in affairs of Europe - they were determined almost single-handedly from now on to manage it fate! And it would be extremely surprising if it were not so. Wilson,

although he was paralyzed, could well secure the ratification Treaty of Versailles with all the articles on the League of Nations - for this it was enough to accept a number of unprincipled amendments by Senator Lodge. However, the States were more profitable portray the matter in such a way that they are supposedly withdrawing from the League, "where England and France predominate." It was a smart move: why would a puppeteer expose himself to the public? "Notebook" historians are studying the archives, and it would not hurt them to get acquainted with the techniques medieval mysteries, where a painted wooden figurine on strings depicted Virgin Mary (from which, in fact, the name of the puppet theater leads). Innocent it is permissible for the public to follow the action on the stage with enthusiasm, but professionals see the movement of the threads and guess the movements of the hands

pulling them ... But in general, the then backstage leadership of the world can only be applauded: it planned the future with a confident hand, widely and without trifles. And it's especially good manifested itself in the way America approached the issue of colonies. Mandates for former possessions The Second Reich was received by all and sundry, even Belgium and Japan. The latter received League of Nations mandate Caroline, Marshall and Mariana Islands. And only the USA received nothing!

Why? What,

poor Uncle Sam could not defend his interests here?

Hardly... You just had to look ahead. In the heyday of the colonial the system lurked its imminent decline. So was it worth it because of the mandate paper to generate irritation or even anger among the future economic slaves of the States? And why

"future"? And without

mandates, America received from the Dutch colonies on favorable terms 86% of raw rubber, 87% of tin, from Asia - 85% of tungsten imports, and so on ... No wonder Chief of Staff of the Red Army B. M. Shaposhnikov wrote at the end of the twenties: "Everyone knows those positions that America's Capital has now won in the world. They are more expensive than territorial seizures."

What about the LEAGUE of Nations? And Europe? Is there a big difference! Isn't the actual management of them passed into the hands of the

dollar? It has been calculated that since 1920, for old debts, Europe has annually repaid banks and to private citizens of the United States 665 million (*then!*) about ten years. And the Europeans did not pay in gold (which by that time was already almost all already migrated overseas), but the securities of enterprises! But such a fee was more expensive than gold. After all, gold is just a bar of metal, and a steel mill is a steel mill! Whatever one may say, events

developed according to Lenin's forecast made in August 1916: "The large financial capital of one country can always buy up competitors foreign, politically independent country. Economic "annexation" is quite feasible without political. And

so it came out! In

fact, after the First World War, the United States received one common mandate to govern Europe and the world, no matter what the "analysts" and "historians" who do not see beyond the official protocols. But they might have remembered that at the "peaceful" Paris conference, Clemenceau yelled in the face of all the future generations of "historians": "To hell! No protocols!

However, it was impossible to do without protocols at all, and in their official package considerable claims were recorded against the defeated Germany from triumphant France ... At first,

France put forward a demand for Germany to sign a blanket, that is, unlimited, obligation to cover all damages caused by the war. greed Clemenceau was clearly more than smart: he still thought that France was in new world something significant. True, frivolous, despite old age, galla no one dissuaded. For what? For

the sake of appearance and for the sake of psychological pressure on the Germans, they agreed with him, although France never got what it originally asked for. In addition, the amount reparations decreased over the years: 226 billion in 1921, later - 132 billion, and then and even less...

One way or another, Clemenceau's traditional hatred of the Germans was incessantly erupted, and it was so rampant that violent protests erupted in Germany. went on a rampage coal "king" Guto Stinnes and the Industrialist's National People's Party Hugenberg. England sympathized with them, because the excessive weakening of the Germans led to excessive strengthening of the French. Did Lloyd George need it? And yet, the

British Lion had to give in something to the Gallic Rooster, for nothing that after Versailles, Britain laid its paw on 60 (!) Percent of the territory and 70 (!) Percent of the population of all colonial possessions in the world! At first glance, such lion's behavior was poorly explained, but behind the seemingly "illogical" behavior bourgeois politicians most often stand on the principles of not "iron", and not even "steel", cannon-like standards, but "*golden*" logic ...

Consider this "illogical" logic on the example of non-British gentlemen from the English Isle, and a German (more precisely, a German Jew) Walter Rathenau.

Former Imperial Head of the Military Raw Materials Department, now Minister economic restoration of Germany, Rathenau did not protest about pirate appetites of Clemenceau. Killed on June 24, 1922, already in the position of minister Foreign Affairs, Rathenau, on the contrary, was an active supporter of unconditional fulfillment of the Versailles obligations - he was killed for this by the German nationalists, among which was, by the way, Ernst von Salomon.

But why did Rathenau defend the principles of robbing his own country, even at the cost of life?

The political hypostasis of Rathenau is widely known; at the Genoa Conference of 1922, he signed the Rapallo Treaty with the USSR, and his assassination by a terrorist Soviet historiography explained by the Consul organization as revenge for Rapallo. Although in circles close to Stinnes, Rathenau was hated with much greater reason for Versailles ...

Is it otherwise, historians often remember *Rathenau-politics*. It is less commonly reported that he was the son of the founder and president of Germany's largest trust, AEG (Allgemeine Electricität Gesellschaft), the General Electric Company.

Rathenau was also a theorist of international "organized capitalism" and "economic democracy" (finding, by the way, some sympathy here with Nikolai Bukharin).

And they completely forget to mention that the AEG was connected by a personal union with large banks, with the Thyssen Steel Trust, Mannesmann Pipe Concern, concern Krupp and the "friend-enemy" of AEG - the Siemens Electrottrust ...

But that's not all! AEG not only had subsidiaries and representative offices in three dozens of countries, but was also owned by a third ... DEK - General Electric Company, the largest electrical engineering trust in the United States, controlled by a financial group Morgan.

Formally, DEC acquired 30% of AEG shares only in 1922, but the division agreement peace was concluded between them even before the First World War - in 1907 ... And therefore *Rathenau the capitalist* was directly calculated to ignore Rathenau the politician. The more cargo in the Versailles "swamp" Germany, the more opportunities the United States had to strengthen its position in the German economy.

Rathenau was also closely associated with the American-Jewish banking group Kuhn, Loeb and Co. That

was the calculation and benefit. The same benefit tacitly frowned on Wilson's thin lips, and on Lloyd's frowning brows. George had to give in.

Clemenceau flaunted proudly, like a cock, on the stage ... At the same time, one can only guess how all three looked at meetings in the Paris residence of the Chevalier of the Order of the Bath and the Legion of Honor Sir Basil Zakharov, since the most delicate issues of the Paris Conference were discussed there. Everything was played, gentlemen historians, not stupid. Whoever and where bragging, really in Paris and Versailles, of course, Wilson was in charge, or rather, banks and monopolies USA. And could it have been otherwise after the First World War, arranged for this?

Formally standing aside - even the Treaty of Versailles was not ratified! - America granted Clemenceau the dubious right to squeeze out of Germany, stupefied after the crash, max. In addition, this ensured the preservation of mutual hatred. the Germans and the French, and the thirst for revenge aroused in the

Germans ... In the end, a solid fraction of both the "lion" British and the "rooster" French share of what was squeezed out of Germany ended up where it was planned - overseas. A defeated Germany, whose economy came under control to a large extent

America, turned out to be not only a "cash cow", but also a "Trojan horse" of American capital in Europe ... Zoologists, classifying this hybrid, would go crazy, but financiers would not be amazed. They themselves created it.

POST-WAR benefits the United States received so much that those invented at the end of the century before last, adding machines failed from overvoltage. Whatever you say, Capital America achieved quite good results for the first time...

Junius Spencer Morgan found his "luck" in the same place as the first Rockefeller - in the mud and the smoke of the civil war of the North and South of the United States in 1861-65. His son John Pierpont Sr., who died in 1913, was not yet thirty, but he worked independently, deftly trading in worthless guns. Grandson John Pierpont, Jr. in the First world traded guns already serviceable. There was no point in catching: the account went to millions of pieces, so there was enough "honest" profit ... Du

Ponts were not offended either: forty percent of the Allied shells were thrown out of barrels with the power of Dupont powders.

Real US exports increased from \$2.4 billion between 1913 and 1920 to 3.4 billion - by 37%, that is, by a third. And the nominal volume of exports due to swollen prices rose three and a half times - up to 8.1 billion dollars. Could the

States achieve such an overpayment for their goods in peaceful conditions? That's it! By the

end of the war, the United States had concentrated 40 (forty!) percent of the world's reserves of gold, and this figure increased. The gross trade turnover of Dupont de Nemours alone for during the war increased from 83 to 308 million dollars. And its capital amounted to a billion! Net profits for four years of worldwide massacre reached 237 million dollars. From of which 141 million were received by shareholders in the form of dividends, and for 49 million Dupont de Nemour bought at first part of the shares of General Motors Corporation, then she thought and bought the entire controlling stake. By

the way, military dividends were calculated from the norm of 458 percent nominal value of share capital ... And because of three hundred percent, as I thought English trade unionist and publicist J. T. Dunning (he was willingly quoted Marx), Capital was ready for any crime "even under pain of the gallows." And then there was not even fear - only dividends! The owner of the most

famous cocked hat of all time brought out the chased one, as if from under mint, the formula: "To wage war, three things are needed: firstly, money, secondly, money, and thirdly, money" ... Well, everyone looks through his telescope. The du Ponts used this formula in an inverted form: "To make money, you need only three things: firstly, the war ... ", and so on ... And were

the Du Ponts alone during the First World War mastered this vile and infamous "science"?

As a result of the ended mutual mass extermination of Europeans, Europe ended up with all her colonies in Uncle Sam's pocket.

Germany had to pay reparations to England and France, and those - debts America. And what difference does it make what it was called - debts, reparations, loans! Gold is not only it does not smell, it is also indifferent to the external side of the matter, to how it is "titled" ... If only money would flow to money. They flowed ... Here

are the figures cited by Lenin in 1920 at the Second Congress of the Comintern with reference to the English economist John Maynard Keynes, who participated in the work Paris Conference, wrote the book "Economic Consequences of Peace" and later became Founder of the economic theory known as Keynesianism.

Lenin said then (PSS, vol. 41, p. 219): "How did debt relations develop between the major powers? I transfer pounds sterling into gold rubles, counting 10 gold rubles per pound sterling. And that's what it turns out: the United States has an asset of 19 billion; passive is nil. They were before war debtor of England ... There are two powers left that act independently now in the world: England and America. Only America found itself in a financial position absolutely independent. She was a debtor before the war, now she is only a creditor. All other powers in the world are indebted. England has found herself in such a position that her assets are 17 billion, her liabilities are 8 billion, she has already half fallen into the position of a debtor. Moreover, about 6 billion, which Russia owes, got into its assets ...".

It is curious how Lenin solved the problem of these six "Russian billions" ... According to example of Alexander the Great, who did not unravel the Gordian knot, but simply cut him, Lenin declared:

"The point is not only, and not even at all, that the Russian revolutionary government does not want to pay debts. Any government could not pay, because these debts are usurious on what has already been paid 20 times, and this same the bourgeois Keynes himself, who has no sympathy for the Russian revolutionary movement, says: "It is clear that these debts cannot be counted." About France,

Lenin said this: "Its asset is equal to three and a half billion, and its liability is ten and a half! AND this is a country about which the French themselves said that it is the usurer of the whole world, because her "savings" were colossal, the colonial and financial robbery that amounted to her gigantic capital, gave her the opportunity to lend billions and billions, in features of Russia. These loans generated enormous income. And despite this, despite the victory, France fell into the position of a debtor ..."

So, as a result of the war, Europe found itself in debt like silk! And all the debts had to be paid to America ... The PUBLIC situation is characterized not only by numbers, but also by era of mood ... An eloquent confession escaped after the war from Percy Harrison Fossett, English geographer, topographer, archaeologist, traveler and officer English army: "I learned from the war the conviction that, as a world power, Britain is at a loss... It must be assumed that thousands of people have lost such illusions over these four years lived in mud and blood. This is the inevitable consequence of war for all, for except for the few who profited from it." Are comments

needed here? Russia in its liability had a country devastated by two wars, centuries-old the consequences of the Tatar-Mongol invasion in the form of a broken national character, backwardness, ignorance of the masses ...

But in the asset, we got a state where Capital had no power. And this was a huge asset in the long run.

If Russia had remained bourgeois, nothing good would have awaited her after the war, this prove the debt figures of old Russia. And here are not numbers, but opinions on the same topic ...

"What we are seeing in Russia is the beginning of a great struggle for her immeasurable resources of raw materials, "the magazine of Anglo-Russian financial circles reported in May 1918 "Russia".

It seems that the London financial news also wrote in November 1918: "Events are more and more take on a character indicating a tendency to establish over Russia international protectorate in the image and likeness of the British plan for Egypt. Such turn of events would immediately turn Russian securities into the cream of the international market".

But with Russia, America had a misfire: the "cream" turned sour, the former securities reason of too good quality could not be used even for the purposes

specifically utilitarian. But with

Germany, the Yankees had solid assets. And it was not only reparations and debts as such. Just one quote from the book of an American economist Richard Saccioli "IG Farbenindustrie" (published in the West in 1947 and in the Stalin USSR already in 1948), just one quote shows what the defeat meant for the USA Germany:

"The American chemical industry, which had begun to develop, was also suppressed by the Germans in the period leading up to the First World War. One of the means by which this result was achieved was the reduction of prices. Within ten years, from 1903 to 1913, German manufacturers sold, for example, salicylic acid 25% cheaper in the USA than in Germany itself. This also applied to bromine, oxalic acid, aniline and other products. A similar means was "forced assortment": to buy any particularly desired product from among the manufactured German firms, the Americans had to buy the entire range of products. So Thus, American firms were squeezed out of the market. In order to thwart German *economic* expansion in America, America and planned *the military* suppression of Germany's potential by the hands of the Entente, to which fastened Russia in advance. And modern

"Russian" idiots from history keep telling us about the "forgotten" "Patriotic" war ...

Sesyli's RECOGNITION is all the more valuable because even in the 1920s people often talked about competition not of American, but of British and German goods. Great Soviet the encyclopedia wrote in 1929 in volume 15 on page 601:

"Essentially, the history of world trade in the era of imperialism (before the war of 1914-18) is the history of intense competition between Germany and England. German the merchant pursues the English literally in all parts of the world. In South America, in Japan, in China, in Persia, in Tunisia, in Morocco, in Egypt, in the Belgian Congo - in all these countries, the share of imports from Germany increases, and from England decreases. German goods are beginning to supplant English even in the markets of the British colonies.

All this was true for yesterday, and if there had been no war, then for themselves twenties ... And for

the thirties? And

for the forties?

Before the war, in 1913, the largest German economist (and practical politician) Karl Helfferich prophesied:

"The development of the German colonies is still in its initial stage. In the future, our promising undertakings will create a colonial market for our industrial products and the culture of raw materials necessary for our national economy, such as cotton crops, and this will strengthen our world position.

Professor Helfferich was an ardent monarchist and, alas, no less anti-Soviet. After the murder of the German ambassador Mirbach by the Left SRs in Moscow in 1918, he was was appointed ambassador to us and soon retired, believing that "it is harmful to create at least appearance of cooperation with the Bolsheviks. But about economic issues Gelferich wrote not out of the blue: he served in the colonial department, was secretary of state for finance, and calculated the national income of Germany. And from his statement it followed that in the thirties and forties, Germany could leave far behind not only England, but and bypass America.

America managed to knock the Germans off the pace with the World War. Now it was possible breathe more freely, and to some extent get German patents, although this "holy saints" in Germany were treated with jealousy and did not really let even the winners come here.

And, I must say, despite all the repressions and reparations, the Germans proved that they were able to resist even on their knees. And German Capital was able to use for restoring lost positions by all means: strong ties with US Capital, disagreements between England and France, but also the potential for relations with a new Russia ...

They also used such a cruel method in relation to their own people as hyperinflation. Inflation had several reasons, and not a single objective one, as, in fact, any inflation in general. Here is the German post-war hyperinflation was explained not by natural disasters and not even by a catastrophic lack of material resources, but by greed, cruelty of Capital and its desire to solve its selfish problems due to the multimillion-dollar masses.

Formally, inflation began already on July 31, 1914, the Reichsbank stopped the exchange banknotes for gold. At that time, "papers" worth 2 billion marks were in circulation. Through nine years, before the stabilization of the mark, paper money was issued for 93 trillion, and maybe and more.

Wages were issued every Monday based on the cost of living indices released last Wednesday. But this did not help either, "the purchasing power of the brand was dwindling not by the day, but by the hour." The last words are not taken from a sentimental novel, but from encyclopedic edition.

The hostesses went to the market with two baskets: one (small) - for provisions, the second (larger) - for paper money. And more and more often they ended up in a small basket not even surrogates (Erzatz), but "surrogates of surrogates" (Erzatz-Erzatz). Far from complete the list of food ersatz exceeded 11 thousand names! Before the war,

only the American worker was paid better than the German worker. And in April 1922, the English statistician John Gilton calculated: to buy the same an American bricklayer had to work one hour for a set of products, an English one three, a French one five, a Belgian six, and a German one seven and a quarter hours.

The dollar exchange rate was three hundred marks per dollar, but the mark was already undermined by the payment the first reparation billion in August 1921, and by the end of 1922 for the dollar gave seven and a half thousand marks.

The year 1923 drove me completely crazy: by March, the dollar was worth 21 thousand, by September - 110 million, and by December - more than four billion marks! Compared to 1913 real wages fell as follows: in April 1922 - 72 percent of pre-war, in October - 55, in June 1923 - 48%.

The Germans were saved only by cheap bread (which, by the way, until the issuance of the law of June 23 1923 was mined according to the apportionment) and the high productivity of a well-established agricultural economy. The German Bauer, even after a grueling war, received one and a half hectare times more wheat than a Canadian, and two and a half times more than an American farmer. But Germany was still starving.

Wage workers only suffered from inflation, and it became a tragedy for the "middle class" - "Mittelstand". In Germany, these people were especially thrifty and willingly invested their savings in "hard-interest" bonds of state and municipal loans, mortgage bonds of mortgage banks. Now, in the course of one year, 1923, the labors of a lifetime and the hopes for a secure old age have gone to waste. Mittelstand He lived exclusively by selling family valuables and belongings. I will

say in parentheses that the "middle class", in terms of their inclinations and upbringing, belonged to socialist ideas are cool, and more often hostile. But he could not forgive Capital torn out "with meat" of the past well-being and sustainability of personal existence. The one who would in the eyes of the burghers, a kind of "average" between socialism and capitalism, and even would put forward anti-Versailles national ideas, would be perceived by them as a Savior. So that a dozen years will pass, and the Mittelstand will especially actively support National Socialism Hitler.

As for Germany's capital, hyperinflation brought colossal ... profits. For him it meant the virtual elimination of all domestic debt. In addition, at the very difficult time when it was necessary to re-establish exports, German industrial tycoons were able to pay their production costs with worthless money and force workers to work, in fact, for food ... But the "King

of the Ruhr" Hugo Stinnes, speculating on the difference in exchange rates and artificially knocking down the mark rate is even lower, created a gigantic association of a thousand enterprises and firms with 600,000 employees. The scam with this Siemens-Rhein-Elbe-Schukert super trust has collapsed (however, in accordance with the plan), and on its ruins a grandiose steel trust "Vereinigte Stahlwerke". It was he who took the leading position in the black metallurgy in Germany and in the European steel cartel.

Germany was then generally a fertile place for people with dollars. Canadian the corporation "United European Investors" was created in those years specifically for buying shares German enterprises: energy, engineering, chemical. Example ordinary, and from the general mass he was distinguished only by the fact that the president of a corporation with a salary the future US President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the famous FDR, became 10 thousand dollars a year ... When the mark

stabilized, the FDR sold its stake, over a thousand shares, for 10 thousand marks apiece.

Stamps are no longer paper, but gold ...

The peak of hyperinflation came in 1923 not by chance. Just then the German Capital and American Capital (in alliance with the British) decided a number of important problems. And the German industrialists also achieved special cohesion for a while post-versailles Germans. This interesting episode was called "passive resistance" in the Ruhr.

In 1922, the Wirth-Rathenau government was in power, and it led the "policy fulfillment of the peace treaty. June 28 Rathenau from his villa in Grunwald set off by car to the ministry. On the way he was overtaken by another car and at the crossroads unexpectedly blocked the way. The driver Rathenau braked sharply, and the pursuers opened shooting. Then a grenade exploded, and Rathenau was killed on the spot. Behind the three killers organization "Consul" Stinnes was easily guessed.

As already mentioned, under Rathenau and Wirth, the Rapallo Treaty with the USSR was signed - April 16, 1922. In the autumn of 1921, former chancellor Josef Wirth told diplomat Moritz Schlesinger, that to the opinion about the need for "going to the East" he came back in the summer of 1921 during a walk with an employee of the Eastern Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Baron von Malzan. And in December 1921, Adolf Georg Otto (abbreviated Ago) background Maltzan, Baron Watenberg und Penzlin, from an old Mecklenburg family, was appointed head of the Eastern Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. However, then Wirth still hesitated, and only in the spring In 1922, at the Genoa Conference, the turn to the East took place.

The German nationalists had large "Versailles" accounts for Rathenau, however, The Rapallo account added up here. On the one hand, a number of large industrialists, many of whom Maltzan had excellent relations, was ready to cooperate even with "red" Russia ... On the other hand, there were many who were oriented now on the Anglo-Saxons, and now the Wirth-Rathenau-Malzan line was useless to them.

So, Rathenau died in June, and in November 1922 Wirth fell (politically). new Kuno became chancellor. Prior to this, Kuno was the general director of the Hamburg America Line, that is, an associate of Morgan. And Kuno's government started wide sabotage reparations deliveries by embarking on the path of that "catastrophe policy" to called for by Stinnes. The

reason for such an outwardly bold turn was the decision of the magnates of the United States and England, which coincided with the desire of Germany to quickly remove from the active European

economic policy of the winner-outsider - France. It was necessary visibly, in some noisy action to show and prove the need for something new in the post-versailles situations. I will say right away that this "something" was supposed to be the Dawes plan, giving life promising hybrid of "Trojan horse" and "cash cow". The two named

goals were transparent, but I think that there was also a third moment. Exacerbating relations between France and Germany, the Anglo-Saxons, together with the Kuns and Lebami ruled out for France the possibility of a realistic policy towards Germany. But in France there were business circles that made plans for such Franco-German economic rapprochement, where Germany was seen as at least equal partner. It was

not difficult to understand that the dynamism of Germany would quickly give her "the first violin", and in return France would receive a stable future, devoid of confrontation Germany.

In general, for France it was a reasonable chance to save a decent position in Europe and the world, without falling under Anglo-Saxon influence. And of course America such encroachments had to be frustrated even before they were clearly formulated, because it was necessary was already thinking about a new future world war, where France again had to Germany to fight, not cooperate.

Everything was carried out skillfully ... In January 1923, the French and Belgians, referring to non-fulfillment by Germany of coal and timber reparations supplies, occupied Ruhr region. The occupiers issued an ultimatum to the representatives of the workers and Directors of the "tribute" by 20 percent more than before, and for refusal they were threatened with a military court, in other words, with execution.

The answer of the Germans was "passive resistance": coal mining and the work of enterprises did not stop, but the railway workers and the Rhine watermen paralyzed the transport network and stopped the export of raw materials to France.

Then the French and Belgians called their railway workers. Resistance increased, factories were already shutting down. The occupiers additionally took advantage services ... of the Poles, who immediately called up conscripts and sent them to Germany to serve the Ruhr industry and transport. Simultaneously the Ruhr, where concentrated three-fifths of the mining and mining business of the country, was cut off from Germany.

And then Berlin ordered to start a complete sabotage. Workers idle, trade froze, the officials went on strike. And the Ruhr lived at the expense of constant state subsidies. At the same time, the coal and iron "kings" of the Ruhr often paid workers with ersatz banknotes. own production (all the same, the money from the workers went only for food), and for paper stamps of subsidies in the same Berlin bought pounds and dollars. The

Ruhr epic finally finished off the mark, as Stinnes wanted. For November 23 1923, the total mass of paper stamps was, according to some sources, 224

septillion.

How many it is in billions, I will not say - I only know that it is something astronomical.

The "Ruhr episode" also had that piquant nuance that the "passive resistance" of ordinary Germans was fed by Berlin subsidies, and the outward recklessness of Berlin, which twisted and turning the printing press, fed from across the ocean prompts: "Resist."

The calculation was correct. In the case of the Ruhr, Germany really bucked for the first time, it smelled like an explosion. France could not cope with it. And then France was set aside in side, and the United States took the European reins in their hands already openly.

At the same time, America now needed Germany not half-dead, but gradually resurrecting. After all, the industrious Germans had to work not only for domestic, German Capital, but also for overseas Capital, which was steadily penetrating into German economy...

Chapter 3 America's New Directives for Europe—The Dawes and Young Plans

NOVEMBER 30, 1923 under the leadership of the American General Dawes and the English financier McKenna, a commission of experts began to work to determine solvency of Germany. In August 1924, at the London Conference of Europe and The Dawes Plan itself was already dictated to Germany. On August 30, 1924, the law on monetary reform, and from that day the plan came into

force. US Vice President Charles Gates Dawes, 60, was part-time also the founding director of the largest Chicago bank "Central Trust of Illinois", associated (what a "coincidence"!) With a group of all the same Morgan, with whom Rathenau was associated.

A number of those leaders of Capital who took part in the development of the Dawes Plan become active figures in the subsequent political history of the world: representatives American monopolies Herbert Clark Hoover - President of the United States since 1928, ubiquitous John Foster Dulles and the future "military" US ambassador to the USSR William Averell Harriman, English banker and diplomat, Lord d'Abernon, British ambassador in Berlin, future German banker of the Fuhrer Hjalmar Schacht ...

During the First World War, Dawes, in the rank of general, in coordination with Bernard Baruch organized military supplies to Europe. First Great Soviet encyclopedia in volume 20, published in 1930, certified him as a symbol of hegemony American capital in Europe, but paid tribute: "Dawes is one of talented representatives of American monopoly financial capital, who had an excellent understanding of the situation in post-war Europe and systematically pursued penetration of American capital into all the most important countries of Europe, especially Germany and France".

Dawes and announced the Higher Will: in the next five years, Germany lays out "on barrel" for one and a half billion marks in gold, then two and a half. Control over the German military industry was sharply weakened, and under the right of control of the German railroads and banks States gave the Weimar Republic the first loan of \$ 200 million to restore the economy.

Other loans followed. There was no need to regret: it was believed that invests in his own ... Actually, the way it was. Germany began to add sharply industrial and commercial turnover, and with the beginning of the implementation of the Dawes plan in the German the future has a steady light. And in the Versailles system, the first hole appeared. On December

18, 1925, at the XIV Congress of the CPSU (b), Stalin said: "The meaning of Dawes is that Germany must pay the Entente ... about 130 billion gold marks in different dates... The Dawes plan drawn up in America is this: Europe pays its debts America at the expense of Germany, which is obliged to Europe to pay reparations, but since all this amount Germany cannot deflate from an empty space, then Germany must receive a number free markets, ... from where it could draw new strength and new blood for payment of reparations. Here America also means our Russian markets...".

However, Stalin immediately warned that America's calculation that "Germany must pump out pennies for Europe at the expense of the Russian markets", this is "a solution without owner"...

"We don't want at all," Stalin continued, "to turn into an agrarian country for what any other country, including Germany. We will produce ourselves machines and other means of production ... In this part of the Dawes plan stands on clay legs..."

Stalin could speak confidently: Leninist-Stalinist Russia kept its fate in own hands, unlike capitalist Europe. At the same Fourteenth Congress, Stalin recalled that only the state debt of Europe to America is calculated on 26

billions of gold rubles, that although Europe began to "more or less rise to its feet beyond account of the influx of capital from America (partly from England)", but this happens "at the cost of the financial subordination of Europe to America"...

So, Germany - on "Atlantic" loans from America and partly from England - began get out of a state of collapse. Control over the German military industry and the people's economy as a whole was canceled, the reparation commission of the allied powers was liquidated.

Among other things, this meant a further weakening of France ... In the Hall of Mirrors The French dreamed of Versailles, of course, great ...

At the end of 1922, the chairman of the financial commission of the French parliament Dariac, in his secret report to Poincare, reported: "If a paper stamp depreciates from day to day, the means of production belonging to Thyssen, Krupp and their associates, remain and retain their gold value. This is exactly what it has actual value." Dariac was

right and made the obvious conclusion: if only it were all under the control of France. I dreamed, I dreamed, but in practice the question of control over the German people economy was decided in favor of American rather than French capital. some the crumbs went to England.

Here is an assessment of the Dawes plan by the Great Soviet Encyclopedia of 1928: "American loans flooded the national economy in a wide wave." WELL, dollars really

fertilized the German economy no worse than silt in the time of the flood of the Nile - the fields of the Egyptian fellahs. In two years, the Germans surpassed the pre-war state of the art. True, this did not mean that the pre-war level was restored. mass consumption: secular women had diamonds sparkling in their ears, working women hungry eyes shone. What the Dawes Plan has become for working Germany can be seen at least from statistics of diseases of miners with pulmonary tuberculosis. In 1913, for a hundred workers there were 0.57 patients, in 1917 - 1.02. In 1920, this figure rose to 1.84, and by 1925 mu has grown to

3.93! And Karl Helfferich in his last year of life (he died in 1924) had reason to evaluate the Dawes plan as a step towards the "eternal enslavement" of Germany. A general and deputy Ludendorff shouted at the vote of the "Dawes" laws in the Reichstag: "Shame on Germany! Ten years ago, I won the battle of Tannenberg (*this is when, due to Rennenkampf killed Samsonov's army.* - S.K.). Now they gave us a Jewish Tannenberg!

But the deputies accepted the plan, large industrialists saw opportunities in it pay off reparation debts and carry out a series of frauds. In this sense, the plan Dawes was very characteristic of the post-war supranational capital of its foreign inconsistency and iron (that is, "golden") internal logic.

The German debt allowed America to infiltrate the German economy without spending it's not a cent. It turned out this way because the American banks that provided Germany loans, immediately issued bonds for them, snapped up by ordinary Americans. Banks immediately turned out to be profitable, and a few years later the Germans - the president worked a lot here Reichsbank Hjalmar Schacht - refused to pay the entire debt in agreement with the Great US capital.

President Hoover in 1931 declared a moratorium on dues. As a result small holders of German bonds lost billions of marks in total, and large banks once again turned out to be profitable. Churchill on this occasion with feigned sadness concluded: "Such is the sad story of this idiotic confusion, which was spent so much work and

effort. Well, Capital has indeed expended a lot of labor here, but the fish from the Versailles pond" was caught not simple, but gold.

In June 1929, at the regular Paris Conference, the Dawes directives replaced named after the fifty-five-year-old American financier Owen D. Young, who

participated in the development of the Dawes plan.

Jung had another post: chairman of the board of directors of the largest US electrical monopoly "General Electric Company" (GE) - the best "friends" of the German AEG. That's not counting posts at the Federal Reserve Bank and "General Motors" restless Morgan.

Do not forget, by the way, Jung and the USSR. He actively tried to tie the Soviet markets to US interests. Accordingly, we were also offered loans. Trotsky and Bukharin such ideas were treated with interest, but the growing Stalin looked at Jung's "generosity" with caution. However, there was

no point in completely ignoring Jung, Morgan and GE, so in 1928, Jung signed an agreement with our Amtorg, according to which the GE allocated 26 million dollars to the Soviet Union for the purchase of electrical equipment. Naturally - at the GE ... As for Germany, the Dawes plan once again established the "final" total amount of reparations - 113.9 billion marks. The annual payments were defined for the next 37 years (that is, until 1966) at 2 billion marks annually. By expiration of this period, the amount of payments could be reviewed or kept in the same volume. In general, reparation payments had to be paid for 59 years, until 1988 (I do not made a mistake - up to one thousand nine hundred and eighty-eight!) years, at the level after 1966 from 1607 to 1711 million marks annually.

That's how long the New World intended to economically milk its new "milk cow" and politically keep it on a leash... But all types of official international control were abolished, and to obtain and the distribution of reparations and settlements on debts, the Bank for International Settlements was created (BIS) headquartered in Basel. The BIS turned out to be a long-liver: it financed the military the revival of Germany after the First World War, after the Second World War helped the formation of the International Monetary Fund, contributed in the 70s to the creation European Economic Community, etc. The Board of

Directors of the BIS consisted of 13 members. I

wonder if it was random? According to

Young's plan, reparation deductions from the profits of industry were canceled, the Germans could again dispose of the Reichsbank and the Imperial Railways, but henceforth, reparations were to be paid only from the state budget Germany and income from railways. By this burden of repayment almost entirely shifted to the shoulders of the ordinary population ...

On the one hand, this strengthened the position of large German capital, on the other on the other hand, the size of the profits of the American shareholders of the German enterprises, and on the third hand, the economic situation of the ordinary German remained in such a way that constant social tension programmed ... The latter was

also part of America's plans: the Germans had to be supported resentment and indignation against the Versailles system, preparing the rise to power ultranationalists focused on revenge, that is, on a new, profitable for America's war.

The Yankees have learned to play on the "Great Chessboard" of the planet! However, then the leaders of Russia were also able to see their cunning moves ... As early as September 20, 1924, in No. 11 of the Bolshevik magazine, Stalin's long article "K international situation", where there were also such words:

"You can, of course, "plan" the transformation of Germany into an inveterate colony. But try to turn in fact a country like Germany into a colony, now that even backward colonies can hardly be kept in subjection, this means laying mine under Europe...".

And at the XIV Congress of the CPSU (b) in 1925, Stalin directly pointed out the danger of a future war in Europe due to the loss of Silesia, the Danzig Corridor and Danzig by Germany ...

However, this is how it was planned by America and the supranational Golden Elite, imperialism, having turned the blood, sweat and tears of millions into gold, now lusted for new superprofits from the new World Massacre ... In addition, now a new task has arisen - already not just the weakening of Russia, but its destruction, for "red" Russia represented everything a great threat to the Golden Elite. Here the

Golden International had a special calculation for Germany, and the German Capital was gradually given "carte blanche" to create a powerful Reich again...

Franco-Belgian troops withdrew from the Ruhr ... And the Young Plan, US President Hoover soon softened for Germany, and then this last reparation plan was generally effectively lifted by Hoover's moratorium on international government payments obligations.

Still: a crow to a crow (in the sense of the Morgan DEC of the German AEG) is not peck out...

Strategically, everything was calculated smartly and with a long-range aim. Squeeze all the juice out the people of Germany to infinity was unreasonable. It was necessary to stop in time to make changes in tactics, while maintaining the control strategy. In addition, there was a body of real and effective

control - the previously mentioned Bank international payments. The official center was now located in the very center of Europe to serve the financial interests of the United States and supranational capital, and these interests in the future provided for war again.

On October 25, 1929, Black Friday broke out on the New York Stock Exchange: huge financial crisis. Shares of enterprises fell and fell, although their walls continued to stand. The

"Great Depression" began ... For tens of millions in America and Europe, it meant tragedy, unemployment... For tens of thousands, suicide. Compared with 1925, the wages of American workers have fallen by half. In 1930, the United States was left without work 4 million people, and soon 15 million. In 1932, steel production

and coal production in the United States fell to 1902 levels. Former United European Investors President Franklin Roosevelt was made now the US president, and he began to save capitalism by leading the States with the "New course."

The situation was indeed serious for Capital, but not so serious that especially fear for their place in the American system of power. Depression of the thirties became a health issue of "bad" speculative blood. Whether consciously or unconsciously, but this method was used by Capital no longer in the first time ... Once upon a time, the influx of contributory gold francs into the Second Reich William the First after the Sedan victory gave rise to a wave of speculative foundations - Grunderstva. The nouveau riches prospered, something fell to the people ...

And five years later, a crisis "erupted" in Germany, the consumption of the masses fell by half, but Krupp's "affair" only grew. Still - the workers were now glad to have a job for bread, for pennies.

For big Capital, crises are a golden time in the truest sense of this sonorous words!

Now something similar - in a different era, on a different scale - was repeated in the United States. After a stunningly profitable war, several tens of thousands of new millionaires, and inconsistency prevented the bigwigs of business from streamlining the management of the emerging gigantic global "enterprise". Now thousands of small banks were failing, but the big ones got stronger.

On the sly in Europe, all American loans were annulled, and His subjects The Majesties of the British King were informed that as a result of war debt They will have to pay the United States of America only on annual interest public debt of £350 million.

The British paid reluctantly and even refused to pay, but this did not negate the fact the fact that on one percent of war loans, America has long ago returned its own with a vengeance, is not counting the newly acquired share in the European economy.

As already mentioned, before the First World War, the United States was largest world debtor, and after the war became the sole, in fact, the world creditor. And if America insisted on paying everyone - three times, in fact, already paid - debts, Europe would simply collapse ... Therefore, extracting excess profits could be stopped temporarily. Moreover, she lost on this, in fact, "small things".

Having started in America, the crisis came to Europe, in a world with the primacy of America to be otherwise it could not. One country turned out to be unaffected by the crisis – it boldly overthrew Capital and self-creating - Stalin's Soviet Union.

Although the decline in the standard of living of the population was widespread, its character in the New and the Old World was different. In the United States at that time, the working masses had no social guarantees, but labor there was expensive. Lower hourly rates in Europe were compensated by developed social institutions obtained in the centuries-old struggle Callus workers with Golden Power. But the European magnates knew how to dodge deftly. The strange collapse of the financial pillar of the Austrian economy and the Austrian Rothschilds - Österreichische Credit-Anstalt für Handel und Geverbe". The Austrian banking system suddenly crumbled like a card house, despite the assurances of the Rothschilds in Paris and London that they are de Viennese The Rothschilds were

"helped". The bankers shrugged their shoulders, and this amazing fiasco of the unsinkable Rothschilds the unblinking blue eyes of the future Führer stared intently from neighboring Germany. IN In December 1933, the Parisian Edouard Rothschild was warned: if he came to power in Austria, the Nazis will take over the investigation of the bankruptcy case of Credit-Anstalt. Accordingly, the Viennese Louis Rothschild was recommended to sit out in the family's villa during French Cannes. And there was a

reason... The fact is that shortly before the Vienna "collapse" the German Foreign Minister Curtius and Austrian Vice-Chancellor Schieber sign customs union agreement between Germany and Austria. Customs borders were destroyed, introduced agreed tariffs and a single customs law. Of course, this was a step towards the Anschluss, then there is the unification of Germany and Austria, which was expressly prohibited by the Treaty of Saint-Germain dated September 10, 1919. "Saint-Germain" was part of the system of the Versailles "agreements" and grossly violated the right of the German people of Austria to self-determination. Went further into In this sense, the Geneva Protocol of 1922, which forbade even an economic union Austria and Germany.

Although Curtius and Schiber alluded to the French idea of a common European union, France strongly protested. German and Austrian Germans threatened in case negative Western position by rapprochement with the USSR. That's when the French financial circles (that is, the Rothschilds) and stopped cooperation with the Austrian banks in trouble. England, on the other hand, was satisfied with the assurance of Germany that its agreement with Austria is due to economic, not political reasons.

The controversial issue was nevertheless referred to the Hague Arbitration Court, and he took the side France.

Still - with the deployment of the Rothschild clan in three major European capitals! Anticipating such an outcome, Germany and Austria, even before the court's decision, announced their refusal to agreements.

The Rothschilds won.

As for America, here is how the amount of money paid dividends, if the level of 1925 is taken as one hundred percent: in 1928 - 157%; in 1929 - 198%; in 1930 - 224%. As you can see, production in the United States was falling, and American incomes rentiers grew.

At the height of the "crisis" they fell slightly: in 1931 to 214%, and in 1932 to 182%.

Yes, they learned to do clever things in the "good New World" ... And it would be possible to say that the well-organized "Great Depression" finally ended the story of the First War Superprofit.

However, it does not hurt, perhaps, to add something else ...

Chapter 4

MORE MIKHAILO Lomonosov noticed that if somewhere something is lost, then somewhere something and will be added. A brief summary of the First World War for ordinary people was expressed in the following example numbers:

About 10,000,000 military personnel died and died

Only killed and wounded, there were *more than forty million* ! Let's add to this an additional deficit due to a decrease in the birth rate and an increase in mortality - approximately 20,000,000 non-births and deaths. No if World War I wasn't global genocide organized by Capital on such a scale for the first time, what then is genocide?

This is how the results of the First World War were expressed in terms of human losses. How were things finance affairs? Even by

the beginning of the thirties, the costs of the First World War had not really been calculated. However, specific figures were already in use and widely used, for example future Prime Minister of independent India Jawaharlal Nehru in his essay letters "A Look at World History". Nehru wrote them for his daughter, young Indira Gandhi, sitting in various prisons in colonial India.

The spring of 1933 found Nehru in the Naini Central Prison, and on April 1 he wrote: "The Americans estimate the total cost of the Allies at 40,999,600,000 - almost forty-one billion pounds sterling, and the expenses of the German states - 15,122,300,000, over fifteen billion pounds sterling. Their total amount is over fifty billion pounds! "... As we can

see, continuous losses and expenses ... So, maybe our great Pomor Mikhail Lomonosov was wrong? And maybe not does the law of conservation of matter work in human society when the guns are roaring?

Uh, no - it works!

Yes, and how!

Speaking of wars, for some reason they always calculate the costs. Although the expense for some is income for others! Is

not it? However, incomes remain, as a rule, "behind the scenes" ... And why? After all, for the first world war was not only spent fifty billion pounds, but received was someone about the same ... That

is, the law of conservation of matter still works in the field of finance, but very peculiarly. At the same time, all states, except the United States, found themselves in debt after the war.

So indebted to

whom? After all, there is only one answer: in debt to supranational financial groups and monopolies, where US capital has already played the first, but by no means the only, violin.

About these incomes received by the few as interest on the blood and tears of millions, he Nehru wrote this: "We cannot properly assess the significance of such figures: they are too far beyond our daily experience. They look like astronomical numbers are like the distance from the sun to the stars "...

Strongly said, but inaccurate. Not for the inhabitants of the Sun or stars, but for quite real some earthlings, these numbers were only at a distance of an outstretched hand to personal secret safe. And, rummaging through it, weak human hands (although is it possible call them "human", I don't know!) took out personal power from there, equaling them hosts with the gods and the Universe itself.

However, more precisely not with the gods, but with

Satan himself! Well, how can you resist such a temptation, ladies and gentlemen, if this temptation irresistible?

And how do the simpletons not understand this?

WHEN Professor William Dodd, who miraculously got to the post of US Ambassador to the Reich, was only only as a sign of an American liberal, he once froze on the Goering estate that, they say, if people knew the historical truth, there would never have been a big war, the British ambassador Sir Eric Phipps and the French ambassador Francois-Poncet in a voice burst out laughing without saying anything...

And the honest naive Dodd could not understand why they were laughing, why were silent? ..

But they knew why... October

14, 1918, when America was preparing to crucify Germany after the defeat Germans in a war that had actually ended, Woodrow Wilson, with the arrogance of a thug enjoying the helplessness of a victim, sent a note to Europe in which unconsciously exposed both himself and his powerful patrons. Wilson ultimatum demanded the deposition of Wilhelm II and motivated this America's desire to destroy "any arbitrary power anywhere, able separately, secretly and at its own sole discretion to disturb the peace on light"...

Wilson further explained: "The power that has hitherto ruled the German nation, and there is such a power as here described.

The American president lied even formally, since Wilhelm was not an unlimited autocratic monarch, and the entire Reichstag voted for war loans, except for Karl Liebknecht. However, the American

president was strikingly accurate in another way - in describing the true nature and methods of power of that Golden Elite, which just "secretly and by own sole discretion" violated the peace in the world in the name of self-serving goals.

And "secretly" is one of the key words here. Real, decisive fates of war and of the world, incomes, as well as their creators and owners, have never been torn and are not torn to the first pages of *written* history, that is, the one that historians later deal with and archivists.

For everyone to see, there will always be someone simpler and more imposing, such as the Kaiser or the laughing guests of Reichsmarschall Goering. However, in order to make not only money, but also history, these "unknown" "heroes" claim in the first place. And they, especially starting from the 20th century, make history in the same manner, according to one scheme: profit on the preparation of the war, then super-profit on the war, then profit on post-war reconstruction of the destroyed economy, and then ... again preparation A big war or a series of smaller wars...

Everything else is just a political side dish to this main activity. supranational capital.

Perhaps someone will object: "Well, so basic! And what about Caterpillar, for example, which makes not tanks, but excavators and bulldozers? And shoe, food, sewing corporations? In all countries, military production occupies a small part of the total economic activity. So is it not militarized Capital, which in

For the most part, is war advantageous?

Well, the answer is hidden in the question itself! If

the war were economically unprofitable for the majority of Capital (that is, otherwise - unprofitable), then it, this prevailing, allegedly not inclined to war majority, is quite could stop the actions of the "lesser" militaristic fellow. After all, as one used to say from the Rockefellers: "What money won't do, big money will do"...

But Big Money is making a Big War in order to make even more money.

Someone Daniil Projector under the wing of the Department of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician Samsonov and the Nauka publishing house, who published the second edition of his opus in 1989 "Fascism: the path of aggression and destruction," ended it like this: "Wars are meaningless." How to say! They make a lot of sense when viewed through the eyes of the Golden International. Owning Elite!

It is appropriate to give the following opinion - incorrect, but taking into account the one to whom it belongs, indicative...

In the preface to Barbara Tuckman's book The Guns of August, her translator Nikolai Yakovlev (later he wrote "August 1, 1914", and then disappeared under the pseudonym "O. Kasimov") reported, with reference to the biographer of President Kennedy T. Sorensen, that Kennedy, long before he read Takman's book, listened as a student to Harvard course on causes World War I ... Subsequently,

Kennedy liked to quote an exchange of remarks between two German chancellors... The former chancellor asked: "How did this happen?", and his successor answered: "Oh, if only I knew!" ...

Kennedy claimed that the Harvard course made him understand "with what speed states, relatively uninterested, plunged into war in a few days ...

Reading this, you do not know whether to laugh or cry?

Was John Kennedy once again hypocritical, or was he really so poorly prepared for the tasks of the head of a great power, that he did not understand a very simple thing: to speak sincerely about both world wars, including the First World War, as some unexpected impromptu, can only be very naive or narrow-minded people.

The French are almost joking about the fact that the most successful impromptu are well-prepared "impromptu" ... The First World War was similar to the Anglo-Saxons "impromptu", subtly carefully thought out and skillfully planned years before war. But

it is unlikely that the Harvard mentors of the future US president introduced him to Lenin's opinion: "The war is generated by the half-century development of world capital, its billions of threads" ... And in this Leninist assessment,

everything was "sewn" to the era with strong "threads". In conclusion, I repeat that neither at Versailles in 1919, nor after it, any there were no particularly serious disagreements between elite Europe and the elite United States. There was a smart, broad, planetary game, there was also dictatorship. There was an accurate "storyboard" of current and future events by the directors supranational Capital - precisely supranational, and not "international", because it does not it is worth dirtying the great word "people" by using it as an adjective to the anti-people noun "capital" ...

At first, the director's remarks were drowned out by the roar of voices of several thousand multilingual delegates in Paris and the pomp of the ceremony in the Hall of Mirrors of Versailles palace.

Then - disputes at other conferences and meetings ... And then - weeping and cursing the "Great Depression" ... However, everything America wanted, it achieved: both in Paris in 1919 and in Paris in 1929. She secured for herself non-colonial mandates that went to hell

more than thirty years later, not the colonies that flew there at about the same time, but the right and opportunity to manage the situation in the world as it was necessary for the capital of America. Of course, not everything conceived was successful, and independent Soviet Russia - as a result imperialist war instead of bourgeois dependent Russia - turned out to be the most a major and painful miscalculation by the Elite. Russia had to wait, but the rest of Europe has become, in essence, a Yankee and CO monopoly firm.

True, the owners of the "company" did not yet know that a potential a threat to their interests. They controlled the economy, they managed to debug pretty well control of political movements, but control over the souls of ordinary Germans could not install. During

the Weimar Republic, everything was mixed in these souls: dark Wagner's chords with frivolous jazz, Beethoven's great themes with a cheerful operetta, Brecht's Threepenny Opera zongs with languid tango eroticism, Spartak marches with "Horst Wessel" of stormtroopers... Different

sounds struggled with each other, merged, broke through one through the other, but they were overshadowed more and more by the melody of a new national hope...

Germany, stunned by the war, chose its new path. Alas, this way Germany was again led to confrontation with Russia. As one said much later Western publicist, Germany rolled (or rather, *rolled* it again) "from Rapallo to Stalingrad "... The

forces that turned Germany on this path were the same as before the First world war, and their goals and objectives were similar, both methods and methods ...

And it's time to understand it.

Afterword. Russia and Germany - together or apart?

The word "epilogue", which has long become familiar in Russian, comes from two Greek words: "epi", which means "after", plus "logos" - "word, speech". So, in Russian seems to be an "afterword". But the epilogue and afterword are not exactly the same, if trust dictionaries. The epilogue

in literature is the final report on the events that took place through some time after the events depicted in the main part of the work. And the afterword is "an explanation following the essay." It is hardly possible to tell in a short epilogue what remains for me to say in this

book. An epilogue can't get away here ... But it won't hurt to explain something additionally. Ten years from Black Friday on the New York Stock Exchange to the first raids

German dive bombers Ju-87 to Warsaw, became one of the most dynamic periods in the entire world history ... For a

fleeting ten years, Germany from the Weimar Republic, crushed Versailles system, turned into a powerful nationalist Third Reich, which absorbed the "Eastern brand" - Austria, ethnically German

The Sudetenland, as well as the Czech Republic as a protectorate of Bohemia

and Moravia ... In the autumn of 1939, Germany easily defeated rotten Poland, and in the summer of 1940 Guderian's tanks pressed the troops of the former Versailles victors to the shores of the English channel of the English Channel near

Dunkirk. Immeasurably - in comparison with the time before the First World War - increased in world and in Europe, America's influence, as intended by the planners of the World Capital. All these years they have been preparing, and now they have started the Second World War.

During the same ten years, England and France have not so much grown stronger as decrepit. An unconditional anti-Nazi, American journalist William Shearer, who lived in Germany from the end of the twenties, he wrote about the German youth as follows: "The young generation of the third Reich grew strong and healthy, full of faith in the future of his country and faith in themselves, into friendship and comradeship, capable of crushing all class, economic and social barriers. He

gave other pictures, observing young Englishmen: "On the road between Aachen and Brussels (*in May 1940*. - S. K.) I met German soldiers, bronze from sunburn, well built and hardened due to the fact that in their youth they spend a lot of time spent in the sun and ate well. I compared them with the first English prisoners of war, stooped, pale, with a hollow chest and bad teeth "...

This was hardly evidence of the progress of the British Empire. Russia, by the end of the thirties, on the contrary, made an even more powerful breakthrough in all walks of life than Germany. Hundreds of thousands of workers and peasant boys and girls from rooms chosen by cockroaches, from the huts inhabited by age-old fleas stepped into the sky - in the truest sense of the word - from the wing of the Osoaviakhimov U-2.

Millions mastered a car, a tractor, a walkie-talkie, a tank ...

Then the dark forces brought a new war to Russia, which became the Great War for us Patriotic...

In 2015, it will be 70 years since its completion, and in the year of the 100th anniversary of the beginning the first brutal war between Russians and Germans, finishing this book, it makes more sense think about its two main historical heroes, Russia and Germany, and also about the world in which they once lived, live now and will live in the future...

The poet called it - "about time and about myself" ... Well said and true, because our ancestors lived, and we ourselves live in a very specific time. At the same time, you and I, reader, live in Russia, but it's only a three-hour flight from Moscow to Berlin ...

SO, the last ones died down - no longer front-line, but salute - volleys of the First World War wars over Paris, London, Washington...

The "peaceful" battles-negotiations have ended.

Multilingual "comfey" soldiers, prisoners of war, internees, dispersed and dispersed to their homes.

In Germany and Hungary, the revolution was defeated, however, very compared to the Russian sluggish.

The peoples peered into the new Europe, reshaped by the war and Versailles. Life peoples continued, but their future was far from cloudless, although in Paris had fun. And this future again depended on how they build their relationship before only two great nations - Russian and German. And after the First World War, as well as before her, it was Russia and Germany who were able, realizing the common destiny, hands not only take into your their own *destinies*, but also *the destinies* of war and peace in general.

Russia and Germany...

Let's look back and see what our countries had in common? And was it they have in common, they are so different, by the twenties of the twentieth century they do not even have a common borders?

There was, of course, a common history, there were long-standing wars between the Russians and Frederick of Prussia, there were also closer wars that Prussia waged together with the Russians against Napoleon ... There were customs "wars", and finally, there was the First World War, which was very much The Germans did not quarrel with the Russians.

I didn't quarrel, probably because Russia has long known Germany better than any another European country. What

was the reason? Since

the time of Peter the Great, the Germans in Russia were not very loved, but he entered the Russian life is so integral that in his description of the Petersburg early morning Pushkin wrote: "And the baker, a neat German, in a paper cap more than once opened his wasisdas."

"Vasidas", as Pushkin himself explained, was then called the "window", into which bakery openings were selling bread. In a

genius, even an instantaneous sketch is deep and vivid, and Pushkin, in one phrase, completely confirmed it. Just a dozen words, but how were the then typical German features noticed: peaceful inclinations, accuracy, accuracy and diligence, cleanliness ... And also that view of life, which was expressed in the German proverb: "Morning hours with gold in

mouth." So the "Russian" Germans lived in our Russia. And

besides the little Russian "Germany" there was another Germany - directly "German", fragmented into small "states". But also fragmented, she thought about future unification at the hands of Prussia and with the help of Russia. On

March 10, 1813, our partisan Denis Davydov, having liberated Dresden from the French, all orders (including the Prussian "For Dignity") spoke in a speech to the city deputation "about the high fate that awaits Germany if she does not betray the call of honor and the dignity of one's name; about the gratitude that she owes to Emperor Alexander, who entered Germany for Germany, and not for himself, for his work has already been done.

True, Davydov later jokingly admitted that in this speech he made extensive use of ready-made phrases from Russian proclamations, "whole heaps of which lay in my memory, like a supply of sausages to treat the Germans."

But, firstly, the tone of the proclamations spoke for itself, and Davydov, in general, did not false. After all, even in the notes about the times of Tilsit (when Napoleon defeated Prussia and flirted with our Alexander) Davydov wrote: "Russia is ahead with its innumerable means for himself, without means for the enemy, immense, bottomless. Behind - Prussia, without an army, but with a people offended in their honor, bitter, brought to despair by the violence of the conquerors, who do not raise their arms only because there is no one to more to come."

Respect for Germany and understanding of the affinity of its interests with Russian interests - on the face. Prussia would have to "attach" to Russia, with all the costs of such an alliance.

Alas, through mutually enriching and complementary cooperation, the two countries, two peoples did not go. Only the great Russian autocrats - and there were them after There were only two reigns of the Romanovs: the Great Peter the First and the Great Catherine the Second - they correctly saw Russia's interest in cleverly taking everything we lack from the Germans.

Alexander the First and Nicholas the First caricatured this principle, giving politics Russia into the hands of German in essence and spirit, Count Kankrin and Count Nesselrode - this evil genius of Russian foreign policy.

Alexandra the Second, and then the Third did not come up with anything better than to get closer to France.

Russia was weakening, losing face, and in the growing Germany began to develop moods, not very useful for us.

IN 1880, the brilliant Russian thinker Mikhail Evgrafovich Saltykov-Shchedrin traveled around Germany and there he accidentally met a fair-haired young man, adopted at first they looked like a "wanderer from the boiler district school." But he heard response: "I am a soldier; we of Berlin teach us a little in Russian ... just in case !

Our great satirist wrote: "We Russians, since Peter I, have been diligently" teaching us in German "and still we can't catch any chance, but in Berlin even now they foresee the" chance "and teach the soldiers" in Russian "".

Shchedrin wrote then and so: "Berlin modestly stood at the head of a modest state. Militaristic encroachments existed in Berlin even then, but they seemed so harmless, that no one inspired either suspicion or fear, although under the shadow of this Harmlessness grew Bismarcks and Moltke ...

The best right of old Berlin to general sympathies was that no one was afraid, no one envied and did not suspect anything, so even the Moskva River did not had against the existence of the river Spree. Nowadays, everything has changed radically. Shyness was replaced by self-conceit, political evasiveness - nothing justifiable claim to universal dominance. Shchedrin caught the

change in German moods shrewdly, but relatively unjustified claims was wrong. There were complaints, to some extent. justified - not for "universal domination", of course, but for one of the leading roles in the world, no doubt.

Mikhail Evgrafovich himself left us (in the essays "Abroad") as "information for thought" the famous "Conversation of a boy in pants and a boy without pants", without at least a partial presentation of which (I highlighted the purely Shchedrin text below in italics) to me, dear reader, it's impossible to get by! And it all started with

the fact that in the middle of the *"highway street of the German village"* Suddenly *"an ordinary Russian puddle moved in"*, from which a Russian *"boy without pants"* to talk to the German *"boy in pants"*.

The owner, extending his hand, greeted the guest: -

Hello, boy without pants! A boy without

pants, paying no attention to his hand, said: "However, brother, it's clean here!" The owner was insistent: -

Hello, boy without pants!

- Stuck like a bath leaf ... Well, hello! Let

me take a look first. See how

clean - nowhere to spit! The

boy in the pants was interested in many things. He asked, of course, and why the Russian the boy goes without pants. The answer for the German was not very clear:

- With us, brother, without a rule, not a single step. Here I am without pants, as a rule, I go. And you in Are pants better? The boy in trousers answered: - I feel

very good in trousers. And if my good parents were pleased to deprive me of this attire, then I would understand this measure in no other way than as a just retribution for my disapproving behaviour.

- These "good mother", "most respected father" were given to you - why are you this the rigmarole started! With us, brother, Uncle Kuzma traded his father for a dog! That's it!

The boy in the pants was horrified:

- Oh, no! This is impossible!

Realizing that "he went too far in the matter of denial", the Russian boy reassured new friend:

- Well, it's full! I'm so ... joking! We have such a proverb, so I remembered. - However, if even a proverb ... oh, what a pity! And how inhuman that such proverbs are repeated aloud in front of the boys.

The German began to cry, and the Russian grinned: - Howled, nemchura! You'd better tell me why such bread will be born in you? I was driving to a puddle along the road - I look, everywhere there is sand and peat, but still there is passion in the fields worts are heaped up! -

I think this is because no one prevents us from being hardworking. No one frightens us, no one forces us to perform such actions that are not for what is not needed ... We began to apply our labor and our experience to the land, and the land returns us a hundredfold for it.

The boys talked for a long time: German - reasonable, Russian - cocky: - Yes, German brother! they say about you that you invented a monkey, and if you look, then where are we against you for invention! - Well, it's still ... - I'm telling the truth. I heard

that you invented such a sign that you want to carry it wherever you want - Now they will give you real money for it? - Of course, they will give real gold or silver money - how could it be otherwise? - And I invented such a sign: the bearer is issued from the change office ... a splash! Here you understand me! Here Shchedrin remarked: "The

boy in the pants wants to understand, but he cannot ." And russian the boy without pants continued:

- We, brother, have a rolling ball, but it's amusing ... - What's amusing here ... "Rolling ball"! - That's kind of fun. You expect that there will be bread - but instead of that, quinoa. Today quinoa, tomorrow quinoa, and the day after tomorrow - locusts, and then - redemption give! Tell me, German, how would you get out here? Not

immediately, but the German answered: - I believe that you cannot do without the Germans! - Come

on, take a bite! - That word again! Russian boy! I give you good advice, and you hardened some stupidity and think it's the answer. Understand me. We Germans have ancient culture, we have solid science, brilliant literature, free institutions, and you pretend as if all this is not a wonder to you. You have nothing like no, you don't even have bread, and when I, on behalf of the Germans, offer you my services, you answer me: take a bite! Beware, Russian boy! this is arrogance on your part, which is positively justified by nothing! - And you are tired of us, the Germans - that's

what! They took it in full, and keep it! You are the truth said: you have culture, and science, and art, and free institutions ... Yes, that's what

bad: who is the most heartless oppressor of the Russian working man? - German! Who the most ruthless teacher? - German! who is the dumbest admin? - German! ...

Here, with your permission, reader, I will intervene in the conversation of the boys to say in parenthesis is...

Russian people themselves, of course, could lay a strong brickwork, grow in Siberia, an excellent harvest ... We were able to go without the Germans to Alaska, go around the world and without the Germans (although not entirely without them) to raise the Demidov

Urals. However, we had so much laxity that German composure often was perceived by us with protest, not because of German arrogance, but because our slovenliness, which neither the boys nor uncles without pants wanted to shorten. And yes, pants too. It was not for nothing that Pushkin

wrote: "'Perhaps" - oh, the people's shiboleth ... ". Shiboleth is a secret a word by which nations recognized their own. And indeed: in Russian "maybe" we hoped too often. But the Germans for centuries developed in themselves a daily thoroughness.

But the "boy without pants" saw something else: - *Only your greed is of the first grade, and since you arbitrarily mixed with law, then you think that you have to gobble up the world. Everyone is afraid of you, no one expects nothing from you, except a dirty trick. Is there any reason for this?*
- *Of course, from ignorance. An uneducated person is the same as an inferior organism, but what to expect from lower organisms? - You see, sausage! You haven't been seen from the ground yet, but what do you say! - "Sausage", "bite"! - what unbearable expressions! And you, Russians, still boast richness of your language! Meanwhile, the matter is clear. It's been twenty years since you you boast that you are going gigantic steps forward, and what does it turn out to be? - what do you poorer than ever ... that no one trusts your solidity, no one counts neither on your friendship nor on your hostility.*

AH, READER, how painfully all this reminds me of something very familiar... Huh? That's just it... In this conversation that

Shchedrin allegedly dreamed of, the relations between the two national features were presented without embellishment. Russian-German contradictions they stuck out here from every phrase and stabbed painfully, but ...

But the Russians really needed German assistance. In the middle nineteenth century Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna Filaret spoke about Russian people: "There is little light in it, but a lot of warmth."

It is well said, not without reason that the same Russian people admitted: "Learning is light, and ignorance is darkness. Unfortunately, this teaching was not very much appreciated by the common people!

And we lacked both light and learning. But darkness was available in abundance. Having covered Europe from the Tatar-Mongol devastation in ancient times, Russia lagged behind advanced peoples thoroughly ... It was

necessary to catch up, it was necessary to learn.

And who?

In Europe (yes, in fact, in the world) there were then only three such countries, without a clear definition of relations with which Russia was doomed to the dangerous indistinctness of the entire foreign and domestic policy. And all three - England, France and Germany - had more than enough greed, envy of Russia and arrogance ... England with her honed cunning, with her

refined, impassive heartlessness and complete disregard for the rights of the weakest was for Russia a partner obviously unusable. It was necessary to trade with England, learn from its achievements and never for a moment

forget that "an Englishwoman always crap."

France was outwardly frivolous, but in reality it was also excellently self-serving, greedy and cruel, which was well proved by its behavior in the colonies, in Russia in 1812, in Spain in the same Napoleonic times ... The Spaniard Goya exposed the inhumanity of the French in his etchings "The Horrors of War" with photographic accuracy and great expressiveness: the French cut the bodies of the Spanish rebels into pieces and planted on the branches of trees. And let's not forget that the terrible words belong to the French: "The corpse of the enemy always smells

good." Russian-French friendship was beneficial only to France and, indirectly, to England. England this helped to weaken Germany, which was dangerous in the future, and the benefits of the French are obvious: the separation of Russia from Germany - a natural, already by virtue of the neighborhood, an ally of Russia ... Plus - protection of France by Russia, quarreled with Germany ...

So they quarreled with us in order to play off in the future! Germany, of course, gave Russia a lot of stupid administrators and pedantic teachers, although there were many benefits from the Germans in Rus'. But France had nothing at all to boast: she supplied Russia with only tutors of not the best condition, but lively French "mamesel". At the same time, economically and civilizationally, the French are increasingly became outsiders in Europe. The

Germans...

A lot has been said about the Germans in this book. Shchedrin defined German culture and science as second-rate ... Remembering at least Kant, Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, Bach, Goethe, Beethoven, Wagner, one can understand that Mikhail Evgrafovich did not judge very well here fair...

In addition, having died at the age of sixty-three, in 1889, he could not know then that the grown-up "boy in pants" described by him, to whom "no one prevented be industrious" will change Germany's place in the world in a matter of two decades.

Helmholtz, Hertz, Roentgen, Planck, Laue, Born, Heisenberg, Nernst, Schrödinger, Haber, Diesel, Benz, Daimler, Krupp - these Germans contributed to world science and technology the beginning of the 20th century is not just a huge, but just the same fundamental contribution!

Accordingly, Germany also claimed a lot. October 1916 in Berlin Friedrich Naumann's book Middle Europe, already familiar to us, was published. Naumann wrote about the merger of Austria-Hungary and Germany and the creation "between the Vistula and the Vosges, Galicia and Lake Constance of the Confederation of Nations" under the leadership of Germany. Actually, this was a plan for the economic unification of Europe. And he was in Russia with certain amendments - in part, say, Galicia - rather useful than harmful.

It is useful, of course, if: 1) agreement with similar German ideas Russia traded for broad advantages in relations with such a European federation; and 2) Russia has become not a monarchist, but a people's right, living not for the "uncle" - Uncle Sam, or there - Jean, John, Hans, but for Ivan and Marya. Such an internally

developed and strong Russia could calmly look at any coalitions and confederations. Not one of them would have moved inside such a Russia!

Wouldn't risk it!

And such a Russia could well count not only on respect, but also on friendship with Germans - a people with whom good relations were of the utmost importance to us.

Moreover, friendship was possible, in general, under any state system Germany.

Tsarist Russia was replaced by Soviet Russia, and already during the years of the first five-year plan, it built thousands of new enterprises, but most importantly, built a new economy based on heavy industry. And a new, "machine" Russia was created with the help of primarily Germany.

The American builder of the Dneproges received from the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR a snuffbox with diamonds ... On the German engineers who invested in our first five years of their mind and strength, the entire treasury of the Diamond Fund would not be enough.

The Rapallo Treaty laid the foundation for new relations between the two countries... On April 10, 1922, an international economic and financial conference opened in Genoa. IN to a large extent, the initiative to convene it belonged to Lenin, and the Supreme Council of the countries Entente at the beginning of 1922 in French Cannes decided to hold conferences in Italy. Five

"inviting powers": England, Belgium, Italy, France and Japan, together with The United States, as a "silent observer" - invited 23 countries to Genoa, including Germany and Soviet Russia.

The goal was proclaimed "to find measures for economic recovery Central and Eastern Europe", but in fact in Italy the West wanted to try Russians for strength and try to impose their will on us.

Absolutely nothing came of this, but a week after the start of the Genoese conference in the town of Rapallo near Genoa, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Chicherin and his German colleague Walter Rathenau signed an agreement between the RSFSR and Germany.

Their first conversations took place on April 4, when our delegation was passing through Berlin. Rathenau then responded reluctantly to Chicherin's proposals. According to the head the Eastern Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Weimar Republic of Malzahn, Rathenau counted on Genoa and the fact that together with France and England, especially with the first, he will get us more. And

it turned out that the Anglo-French German delegation was eliminated from discussions, and Rathenau began to worry: on the contrary, the Russians would not agree with the Entente at the expense of Germans. Rathenau would not have been forgiven for this in Germany, he was already unreliable "in the saddle" ... Confused Maltsan began to visit Chicherin, and late at night arranged with Rathenau and colleagues the historic "pajama meeting". It was about whether to sign peace treaty with the Russians. April 16 Rathenau with the knowledge of Berlin decided to sign!

Russia and Germany restored diplomatic and consular relations and most favored nation treatment in trade. Economic cooperation, and political cooperation was implied. We mutually renounced

all property and financial claims. Germans - from compensation for Soviet nationalization measures, Russians - from compensations due Russia under the Treaty of Versailles. The last refusal was even more important than could be assumed. When

drawing up the Versailles ultimatum to Germany, the Entente did not forget about Russia. Article 116 of the treaty gave her the right to reimburse war debts at the expense of Germany in the amount of 16 billion gold rubles, while our debts to the Entente amount to almost 9 billion. In addition, under Article 177 we had the right to reparations. The calculation was not stupid: billions were more on paper, but if we were seduced by this bait, then, firstly, we would immediately tie ourselves to the allies. And secondly, for many years they complicated relations with Germany. It turned

out differently! Yes, and how else! Even before Rapallo in 1921 in the ministry Reichswehr, a special group of Major Fischer was created to establish contacts between the Reichswehr and Red Army! On August 11, 1922, the first provisional agreement was concluded between them.

However, both countries were determined to cooperate not so much in the field of "guns" as in the field of oil. March 23, 1922 (also before Rapallo) between Russia and the company "Friedrich Krupp in Essen" a concession agreement was concluded for the delivery of 50 thousand acres in the Salsky district of the Don province for a period of 24 years "to maintain a rational Agriculture". The concessionaire completely set up the farm with all inventory and buildings, and as a payment he gave us a fifth of the harvest, but most importantly - experience.

In this instructive story, and mutual benefits, and mutual misunderstandings, and ways their elimination was reflected as in a drop of water. Already after the signing of the agreement by Moscow German directors balked at the Krupp representative office, although they asked for a concession themselves. Lenin proposed pressing Krupp, and we had something to press... In Sweden and in Germany, at Krupp, Russia placed an order for locomotives and railway equipment. Their share depended on good relations with the Germans. Negotiations began, and on March 17, 1923, Krupp signed the agreement. His agricultural concession existed on the Don until October 1934.

GERMANY continued to be our largest external partner and still the only one, cooperation with which was vital for us.

Even the defeat in the First World War did not knock down the Germans. Descended from Russified Swedes, Soviet optician Sergei Eduardovich Frish wrote about his German impressions of the 20s: "With the Treaty of Versailles, the Allies tried to neutralize Germany, destroying primarily its economic potential. Deprived of iron ore, coal, colonial goods, crushed by monstrous reparations payments, Germany was to become a third-rate, obedient state. But in reality it turned out differently: already in 1920-1921, Germany turned into competitive exporter. In England they said: what can you do if On the foreign market, a German steam locomotive costs less than an English washbasin!

No, it was definitely worth being friends and cooperating with such a people in Russia! Yes and learning from him did not interfere with much: national pride, accuracy, calm, not emergency-artel "rush, guys!", But thoughtful, daily diligence. In fact, we were studying then ...

When preparations for a new organization of science in the USSR began in the twenties, Soviet scientists went to Europe and America in order to look at Western systems of scientific work, compare and draw your own conclusions. In 1923 indispensable (both by position, and in fact since tsarist times) secretary of the Academy Sciences of the USSR Oldenburg traveled to France, England and Germany.

When he returned, he wrote that the eighteenth century was the century of the academies, the nineteenth was the century of the universities, and the twentieth century was becoming the century of scientific research institutions. And in this sense, we paid special attention to Germany. From 1925 to 1930, the journal "Scientific Worker" published fifty reports on science in various countries, and twenty of them were about Germany.

"American" reports turned out to be a dozen. Abram Fedorovich Ioffe was in the USA in 1926 and came to the conclusion (quite rightly) that anti-intellectualism and overt commercialization is distorting science in America. There really was not so much doing science as buying it - even then all over the world. In Germany,

the Kaiser Wilhelm Society was created long ago, and its network research institutes was a good example. In the middle of 1927 in Berlin The Week of Soviet Scientists was held. There was nothing particularly new here, the history of scientific contacts between Russians and Germans left, as we remember, in the time of Peter the Great.

And only whether scientific! Even the coming to power of the Nazis did not abolish the possibility such a powerful, joint integrated Russian-German influence on the fate of world civilization, which in the short term would result in lasting European peace and, in the long term, global peace.

After all, if only two countries of the world - Russia and Germany - did not allow for themselves and thoughts of war with each other, then all other countries could not unleash the Second World War - at least in its terrible form that it took - could not ...

In 1954, the memoirs of Prince Felix Yusupov, Count Sumarokov-Elston, the same one - the murderer of Grishka Rasputin. Yusupov lived a life stormy, very careless, did not bother himself with the sciences. But the figure was

of course, interesting, in some ways outstanding already at the genetic level.

At the end of 1916, Yusupov, together with Grand Duke Dmitry and a Duma member Purishkevich put an end to Rasputin in the name of continuing the war with Germany. And through for almost forty years, in exile, having grown old and wiser, he reflected on the amazing fate Russia, which is friends with enemies, is at enmity with friends. Like, Russia with Germany and there was no point in fighting. Dynasties have intermarried, peoples do not get angry at each other ...

This was written after two world wars, after the ruins of Sevastopol and Stalingrad, Berlin and Koenigsberg, after blown up plants and factories that were built in Russia, Russians and Germans are

together ... Yes, the paths of Russia and Germany in the twentieth century diverged abruptly, although their fates were connected and firmly connected to this day, regardless of whether Russians and Germans understand it or not...

Today we know how relations between Russia and Germany developed in the twenties, in the thirties of the twentieth century, and even more so in the forties, according to the exact expression poet - "fatal" ... Well,

what now? What
tomorrow?

In the preface to this book, I wrote that today Russia is being taken with bare hands. AND Germany is also taking revenge in Russia. One of my friends drew attention to the fact that the German partners of his enterprise, which is still the largest in its field of heavy mechanical engineering - for several years in a row they sent *unequal* agreements on joint annual works, each time signed by the German side *on June 22* of the next year ...

The first time we decided that it was just a coincidence. For
the second time, we understood:
alas, no ... So what lies ahead for us - a new June 22
or ...? Although this question is ripe, it has not yet been raised in the way it deserves.

MAYBE, everything is over for Russia already? Maybe no one threatens us anymore, like that cowboy Johnny, who was elusive simply because he was neither scary nor needed by anyone? Here is the Italian journalist Giulietto, who lived and worked in Russia for a long time. Chiesa sighs in a minor key in his book "Farewell, Russia" ...

And, as in the early twentieth century, at the beginning of the twenty-first century in Paris, popular the slogan "Russia is no longer considered" ... And the Frenchman Francois Schlosser in French Nouvelobs claims that "economically, Russia is a dwarf state, its gross national product is three times lower than that of Belgium.

In Belgium, the edge of which Germany twice passed into France, there is almost no such noticing!

We are told that Russia is weaker than Portugal...
And Germany?
Well, Germany is still Germany. Newly united
politically, still geographically and
geopolitical center of Europe, it is the undisputed economic leader of the European Union ...

Is it possible to harness a half-dead "Russian" nag and self-confident
Brandenburg horse? It is
unlikely ...

Yes, and there
is no need. But this is - if I nag ... And Russia, to this day, is poorly groomed and half-starved
Oryol trotter without a caring owner. Feed - it will carry you into the distance! And
Germany?

Yes, and with her, too, not everything is clear. Take the same association - the Germans themselves sometimes compare it with an avalanche: they say, too unexpectedly, it *fell* on them... This is not a very joyful and not very confident perception of what is happening now.

The well-known German journalist Oskar Fehrenbach, who headed the newspaper for a long time "Stuttgarter Zeitung", at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, wrote a book with seemingly optimistic title "The collapse and revival of Germany", but in it in a strange way the motive "Farewell, Germany!" also slips through ... And

in 2003, the ROSSPEN publishing house published a book by Andrei Zdravomyslov "Germans about Russians on the threshold of the new millennium", where 22 expert interviews were given with representatives of the German intellectual elite about Russia - its past, present and future, with content analysis and commentary... Much has been said it was, of course, about Germany itself.

Without dwelling in detail on this monograph rich in "information for reflection", I will cite an excerpt from a conversation with a professor of history at the Free University Berlin Klaus Mayer ... born in 1928, he was sixteen years old was drafted into Wehrmacht, managed to make war, was captured by Russians, where he met with him - in fact, almost boy, - "a very good attitude from the Russians" ...

Asked what it means for a German to be German, Professor Mayer replied: "I think the role of the nation in Germany is not particularly great. This is a small (? - S.K.) country in Europe. Let's take football... The Turks won the European championship, and all the local Turks are celebrating in the street... This is a big event for them! You see! I think that the feeling of nation among the Germans is not so... not so widespread. We have small right-wing groups, politically right-wing youth, but this is not an idea that unites the whole nation. In fact, there is a broader idea -

Europe, and then the German nation! Or Germans who vacation in Italy, Spain, etc. - this is Europe for more part of the population...

Here, it turns out, how! In the opinion of many German citizens, a Greater Germany is just the past. The past is the Germany of Beethoven and Wagner, Thomas Müntzer and Luther, Dürer and Bach, Friedrich the Great and Bismarck, Kant and Hegel, Gutenberg and Goethe, Clausewitz and Moltke, Wernher von Braun and Leni Riefenstahl... And some would like to see

Germany in the future just a Central European power without great aspirations, but also without the risk of great deeds.

So - something like big, big Holland or Denmark ... But what about Russia? And what

about *her* glorious and great list of geniuses, warriors, thinkers, scientists, heroes? Yes, despite all the

assurances of the "Putinists", the geopolitical, economic, cultural and military-political situation in which Russia is now bogged down can be assessed as almost catastrophic, almost irreversible. But with well-defined reservations.

A catastrophe for Russia is possible, but not inevitable.

Moreover! Russia's final catastrophe is *an unnatural* possible perspective both for Russia and for the world external to it. Moreover, this is a disastrous prospect for everyone ...

And how then should we relate to the statement of the Parisian Schlosser, equating Russia with Belgium?

Well, this comparison is wrong, of course, both in substance and formally. Russia with any point of view, not Belgium ..

And are we really "behind" from the same Portugal, with which for some reason Russia is at risk compare? Take, for example, Portuguese science ... Will it get to the level

development and results of even the current Russian science even after a couple of decades? Russian science seems to be humiliated, and offended, and impoverished, but its West is still day steals with no small profit for himself. A real

beggar cannot be robbed. The French are again fanfaronistically humiliating Russia. But here are some numbers for them and our information with you, reader ... In

1987, the operational length of French railways was 34.6 thousand kilometers, and the freight turnover of railways - 51.3 billion ton-kilometers. Indicators Russian Federation in 1990 - 160 thousand kilometers (of which 87 thousand - total use) and more than 2500 billion ton-kilometers. Of course,

Europe likes to carry goods on the highway, not on steel tracks. But in general Russia even now, with the economy destroyed by the Yeltsinoids, supports the general domestic cargo turnover at a level many times higher than French, not to mention about Belgian.

Moreover, the fact that for European transport communications is a disaster (I have it seems like a mediocre snowfall), then for Russia it is the norm. So your cargo turnover to us much more difficult to maintain than the French, Belgians or Portuguese.

And everyone is trying to push us into the category of dwarfs.

Why? Yes, if only because at the mere thought of such a prospect, when Germany decides honestly stretch out a hand to Russia, the same Euro-France is pierced by frost on the skin even in golden Parisian autumn. From one such thought, Marianne in a Phrygian cap in turns blue in fear, like a brand new "euro"-twenty ...

So, in Uncle Sam, such thoughts can immediately color him physiognomy in a yellowish-greenish "bucks" color. At the same time, an honest Russian-German alliance would not only not threaten legitimate interests of the French and any other people, European or otherwise, but also would provide a Europe completely different from the current one, a Europe independent and selfish.

Moreover, the triple European Union could also have brilliant prospects. Russia, Germany and France - a kind of truly cordial agreement ...

IS such a joint perspective POSSIBLE? Well, my dear friend and contemporary, a lot depends on a lot, and I'm not a Parisian fortuneteller ...

But *then*, which is now being gradually *twisted* by America in the vastness of our blue planet, is unlikely to promise peace to its inhabitants already, perhaps in the coming years. It's not only the traditionally self-confident Yankees who are behaving very unreasonably today, not only the humiliated and insulted peoples of the world, but even quite prosperous, it seemed Europeans... The

Ukrainian syndrome reveals this, alas, with all the obviousness.

Moreover, modern Europe does not reveal a special flight of thought and feeling. Not managed to enter the "euro" circulation, and Oskar Fehrenbach already sadly stated that the European de Union was in a "state of stupor" and that there was nothing to dream about a new "European century" ... There is nothing, including because in Europe at the moment there is no a leader capable of breathing life into the process of true European integration.

This was said in the first years of the new century, and the crisis of the past ten years "United" Europe only strengthened. And they begin to acknowledge more and more loudly that Europe intends to it is even stronger to tidy up America under your

ass ... Boring, it should be noted, option. But only Russia can be the leader of original Europe! Not Putin, really...

The Germans twice clashed with Russia, and both times they were defeated. But both Russia times ended up in ruins to the delight of America. Today Russia is dilapidated for the third once, and this time it collapsed by itself, without visible external aggression. Aggression,

of course, was, but hidden, systemic, with the participation of both the United States and Europe ... However, will the Germans, together with Europe, still have to reap the bitter fruits of their bloodless (for the West) victory over Russia?

And is it a victory for Europe and especially for Germany? After all, both man and people are satisfied when they internally feel that their position is at least approximately equal to their capabilities.

Does the current position of Germany correspond to its civilizational potential? Once upon a time, Germany claimed a leading world role, and with the right choice of path to this goal (a path in alliance and partnership with Russia), it could eventually, no, not rule world (with a strong Russia, this is impossible for anyone, and Russia does not need), but by right together with Russia to lead the peoples of the world in their creation of a developed and sustainable planetary civilizations. Instead, the Germans

are now facing the fate of some Americanized burgher, which historical memory was completely eliminated from consciousness, replacing it with contemplation carefully restored medieval castles and eating fast food ... Such a the Germans achieved a "victory" over Russia in an "alliance" with America.

However, somehow I can't believe that the descendants of those soldiers who could almost to the last to stand in Stalingrad, which is alien to them, and to the last - in their native Berlin, it's so easy put up with the role of civilizational idiots that America imposes on the world with such on a truly American scale, which successfully idiotizes itself ... If the Germans can follow

the path of searching for themselves, then this path is inevitable will lead them to Russia not as a possible object of conquest and exploitation, but as the only country in the world that can sincerely and successfully understand thoughts and feelings Germans.

More than ten years ago, Angela Stent's book *Rivals of the Century* with an appeal to Germany to take on a special responsibility for the fate of Russia.

Thank you, of course, for such an impulse, but today we must demand from Germany first only for it to take full responsibility for its own fate. And if Germany turns out to be capable of such a step, then this will mean her a conscious movement towards a strong Russia as a guarantor of an inspired original German fate.

After all, the author of "Rivals of the Century" is sure: "The relationship between Russia and Germany and in the 21st century will have a significant impact on the architecture of Europe and its system security."

I would like to clarify and deepen this thought in only one thing: speaking together and rightly having learned the lessons of the past, we are able to have a decisive and beneficial influence on architecture around the world.

GERMANY throughout its recent history has repeatedly demonstrated the ability to concentrate the efforts of the state and the nation in order to reach leadership positions in the world.

And in each case, one of the main (if not the main) systemic factor of this turned out to be an amazing and saving ability of German society to quickly the acquisition of a high psychological tone as a basis for the intensification of social economic and political efforts.

In fact, the Russian people are capable of this. But how - we harness for a long time, but quickly we go. That's what the German Bismarck said about us. And this is not accidental: kindred natures are able to sometimes notice in a partner such details that he himself does not really notice partner.

On the eve of the Franco-Prussian War of 1871, fragmented Germany belonged to outsiders of the global political process. And after the victory of Prussia over France and the proclamation of the German Empire, Germany in two decades has become in many ways positions in the second world power, having a good chance to bypass even the United States.

After the defeat in the First World War, Germany quickly strengthened, consolidated and developed dynamically and efficiently.

After its most devastating setback in World War II, Germany recovered the longest, if we keep in mind the psychological aspect of society. Perhaps Germany did not even recover psychologically; if after World War I war, the victors failed to instill a guilt complex in the Germans, then after World War II war, the Anglo-Saxons succeeded in full. Moreover, it is the Anglo-Saxons, who do not only suffered the least in that war, but they are more responsible for it than any other peoples. On the contrary, Russia, to

which Germany in the second war with her brought an abyss of grief and brutal devastation, never poked these Germans under the nose. Already during the Great of the Patriotic War, Stalin in the holiday order of the People's Commissar of Defense of the USSR of February 23 1942 No. 55 stated: "It

would be ridiculous to identify the Hitler clique with the German people, with the German state. The experience of history says that the Hitlers come and go, but the German people, and the German state remains "... It was the

noble voice of a great and noble people, in contrast to the accusations Anglo-Saxons, whose cement of prosperity has long been the public and state hypocrisy.

Rare examples of the opposite only confirm the last conclusion, and are interesting in this regarding the assessments made already in the 21st century by the American professor Guido Giacomo Preparata:

"An incredibly huge mountain of lies that the representatives of the Anglo-American establishment have piled up in order to preserve in the eyes of the societies of their countries (*and only their own?* - S.K.) the myth that the Second World War was a "good" war, in where justice prevailed...

In fact, the allied elites told the tale. The tale that the Germans have always been troublemakers; once they violated the peace and were punished for it, however, too severely (*according to the Treaty of Versailles.* - S.K.). Due to ... redundancy of punishment God knows where the power of Evil materialized (*that is, Hitler.* - S.K.) ... Further in the tale it is said that the malignity of this force has increased so much that in order to eradicate it it took the most severe global conflict. This is not just a

harmless fable, it is an insult ... ". This is not just an insult, I will add, this is a crime not only against history, but also against the future of peoples, because malicious myths about immaculate robes The Anglo-Saxon Prosperous Elite, which leads the world, is not allowed to build a coherent and correct system of causes and factors of the origin of the two world wars, starting from that World War I, the 100th anniversary of which has already

arrived. Perhaps it is worth acquainting the reader with what words Professor Preparata finishes his book: "... individuals, as Machiavelli wrote in his "classic" manual on inhuman behavior, are "simple" and themselves want to believe in the words uttered by legitimate authority. Legitimate authority, which we consider to be the embodiment our will, but which in reality is nothing but high fortress walls hiding the oligarchy and its lies. With both, history will eventually bring its

accounts." It seems that the historical term of the world oligarchy and its lies is indeed running out, if even the bourgeois professor Preparata - by no means an adherent of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin - prophesies their end!

However, without a strong Russia that restored the identity of Russia, as well as without a restored originality and craving for the spiritual greatness of Germany, this is unlikely to become possible. That is why they are trying to eradicate from the souls of both Russians and Germans the memory and pride of their great services to the world, replacing it with a sense of guilt only.

Both the Russian and the German soul are constrained, constrained today ... And the German Oskar Fehrenbach with the indifference of the eunuch, he declares that Germany has "lost interest in Europe." But Germany is losing interest in itself... Especially young Germany...

Millennium, where, among others, a conversation in Cologne with the wife of a professor Gerhard Zimon Nadezhda Petrovna Zimon. Former Soviet citizen who graduated from philological faculty of Moscow State University, in the 70s, while working at Intourist, she met her future husband during one of his visits to Moscow and by 2003 more than lived in Germany for a quarter of a century.

Some assessments of this "German" Russian are quite indicative, for example: "We are on the West are very lazy ... when a person lives well, he becomes not so vigilant ... and he does not notice how something is taken away from him, the most important values..."

At the same time, while working in the German Union of former prisoners of war, Frau Simon competently testifies: "Soldiers (*veterans*. - S. K.) and prisoners of war have an attitude towards Russia is very positive, much more positive, there is more interest in Russia than, let's say, among young people. Young people are not interested in Russia at all. They are absolutely indifferent, for them - whether it is Russia, or whether it is the Czech Republic - well, good, big territory!". Alas,

we are seeing this today in Russia, and in Russia there are already a lot of young people are not interested in Russia. And for reasons similar to those in Germany... This is today. And tomorrow?

Firstly, we again have a united Germany, and secondly, there is still a tendency to get rid of the guilt complex. In Germany it has always been a harbinger the emergence of serious social changes and, alas, also revanchist sentiments. The first can be an invigorating shower for Germany. The second is... Well, revenge can be different. At the expense of Russia, Germany never broke off "... Together with Russia, she had success - in the same wars with Napoleon ... The growth of right-wing sentiment in Austria, which traditionally gravitates towards Germany. After all, the idea of the "Anschluss" - the reunification of Germany and Austria - does not apply to the times of Hitler, and by the seventies of the XIX century.

BUT GERMANY (and is she alone?) will only reckon with the strong. Is it strong Russia now?

Of course not.

Nevertheless, only Russia, having revived itself as a socialist allied power, can become an effective strategic partner, and even an ally of Germany. A Germany in a bloc with a resurgent Russia could become more than just a center of opposition attempts to establish US hegemony in Europe and the world. Germany together with Russia (more precisely, Russia together with Germany) can become the center of crystallization of the new world order is not in the interests of the US elite, but in the interests of the Planet and its inhabitants - bipeds and quadrupeds (and the latter cannot be mocked endlessly). To the whole world, individual (especially small) countries and individual human teams need leaders - hardly anyone will argue with that. However, no one suitable for the role of leader, it is completely self-serving and wingless, sanctimonious and arrogant

"tumbleweed" America...

America has already brought yet another turmoil to Europe... It has inflamed the wounds of the Balkans, brought Ukraine into a state of lunatic asylum... And in the future, America's patronage means new wars, turmoil and national humiliation.

Not a single self-respecting people (except for the dregs of society, accustomed to eating handouts and the remnants of fast food) nowhere and never treated with joy and respect for American presence in their countries. Coca-cola, gum, idiotic "cheerful" "smile", a baseball cap pushed back with a visor and other delights "American way of life" is perceived only by the undeveloped part of the peoples. And the one who has a developed sense of national dignity, if not at a demonstration, then at least within the walls of his own house, no, no, yes, and he will say, at least to himself: "Yankee, go home!" ...

But here is the proud Norwegian Bjornstern Bjornson (1832-1910) - Nobel laureate awards, writer, author of the national anthem "Yes, we love this land" - a patriot before pen tip. In 19th-century Norway, they said about him: "To name Bjornson is like raise the Norwegian national flag." Such a person in lackey feelings is not suspect. However, it was Germany that he gave natural primacy in Europe ...

Bjornson was spiritually connected with Russia - we knew him, loved him, translated and published, in the Russian press Bjornson published journalistic articles and emphasized the leading importance of Russian literature in the development of contemporary world literature ... It was not in vain that all this happened, and it was not without reason ...

EURASIANS talk about the "destiny of Russia"... They say that it exists – Europe or Asia?... They argue whether her calling is to be a bridge between Europe and Asia, between West and East? But

the vocation of Russia is simply to be! And if she will exist for herself itself, it will also exist for the entire external world. No wonder the natural *German* Catherine the Great called *Russia* the Universe . So we need to justify this long-standing characteristic.

Someone's leadership of Russia is not required, it is not imposed on anyone as a leader. And this despite the fact that only Russia's leadership can be beneficial for the world - the people's Russia, of course... We have no ecumenical claims, but there are ecumenical potencies!

And the great Catherine confirms this. They talk about the "God-bearing people" ... This is nonsense, even intellectual fiction in relation to the most striking moments in the history of Russians ... However, Russia and Russian people in the history of the world stand really apart. For example, Russian history no other gives reason to assert that the Russian state, according to the criterion of "power restraint", turned out to be uniquely peace-loving. Saint Vladimir,

Yaroslav the Wise were hardly less militant than their Western European colleagues, and from the armed expansion of their possessions refused. But Rus' had a special lot - in the early Middle Ages we had to be in the path of a wild nomadic wave. It is unlikely that it will be true to say that Russia *stood* on her ways. No, we were right there. Taking on this pressure, the Russian people at the cost the loss of his own civilization saved European civilization. Tatar-Mongol raids burned the Russian land, weakened and crushed the Russian state, and as a result it was forced to conduct an exclusively defensive politics. The conquering potential of the Russian princes (the people were not overwhelmed by this idea) or otherwise not implemented. And, in fact, Russia did not wage aggressive wars - it gradually expanded to its natural geopolitical limits, without going beyond them.

Yes, Russia had to fight, but defending and defending itself. Therefore the Russians brought up as warriors, while not accepting the war itself, regarding it as a misfortune, misfortune, evil...

This special "peace-loving" feature of ours is manifested even in language: the word "peace" in Russian language means two, although internally related, interdependent, but still different concepts. Modern spelling has leveled the characteristic detail, which in the old grammar was obvious. The word "world" in Dahl's dictionary is defined as "absence of quarrel, enmity, disagreement, war; harmony, agreement, unanimity, friendliness, friendship, goodwill; silence, peace, tranquility. The word "world" (through

"i") The same Dahl interprets as "the universe; ... our earth, the globe, svt; all people, all holy, the human race "...

And it was Russia that gave the world the great slogan: "Peace to the world!" people capable of such fundamental ideas, "Varangians" are not needed.

A reliable partner in the outside world is needed. And, as at the end of the century before last, in at the beginning and during the past century, at the beginning of a new, beginning century, such a partner for Russia there can be only Germany - also, of course, spiritually renewed itself.

It is necessary to break those vicious circles of witches, which are hostile to Germany and Russian forces over and over again outlined and outlined around us so that we could not move them towards each other.

Here is another circumstance ... The ancient Greeks provided the world with a sonorous prefix "pan ...", which in Greek means "everything." According to the dictionary, this prefix "in complex in words it means "referring to everything, embracing everything" ... And in

the political history of the world there are certainly *complex* words-concepts: Pan-Germanism, Pan-Slavism, Pan-Islamism...

There is, however, Pan-Americanism...

Today they are trying to make the latter a reference point for the whole world, although the symbol America is now not the torch of the Statue of Liberty, but Monica Lewinsky's panties and a snout smile Marine... And what about

the first three concepts with the prefix "pan ..."? All three belong, in fact, to the realm of idle dreams ... For nothing, in the name of pan-German ideas, the Wehrmacht reached the Volga, Russian men were thrown under Thessaloniki, which they absolutely did not need, in the name of Pan-Slavist ideas, and Pan-Islamism still scares the world today.

At the same time, among the peoples among whom these arose, outwardly not just different, but extremely hostile to each other - concepts, there is something in common. And above all, that a state of mind that is not very accurate (rather, not at all accurate!) Is called German

daydreaming *sensibility* , And this *Eastern fanaticism* . , Russian state is more precisely defined as the ability to be guided at decisive moments sincere, great feeling, and not petty calculation. The Russian is not sentimentally sensitive. He is on his own mind, but it is necessary - he will explode on his chest shirt!

The German seems to be prudent. But how lofty and romantic German music is... And how Russian music is akin to it ... The

East is a delicate matter ... A Muslim is even more in his mind and even more capable hide and hide in his turban shell than a Russian peasant ... But no friend, more wholehearted than an oriental person, if you are really his friend.

Pan-Germanism, Pan-Slavism, Pan-Islamism are *fantasy* concepts that divide *in somewhat* related peoples, despite the fact that semantically these "pan...isms" means something that "encompasses everything." However, the relationship of some indigenous traits of the national character of the German, Russian-Slavic and Islamic peoples - this, perhaps, is not a fantasy ... Readiness for

latitude and subordination, individualism, combined with a penchant for collectivism - the Germans, and the Russians, and the peoples of the East have it ... And history itself proves that only Germans and Russians knew how to get along with Islamic peoples ...

The phenomenon of the Englishman Lawrence does not refute anything here, because Lawrence himself was an Englishman, very unusual for England.

Today, America is active in Asia and it, as they say, "breeds" the Islamic East, pushing it onto the path of a suicidal foreign and domestic policy.

But tomorrow the common Russian-German line, if she gets in touch, can create Islamic Asia new chances and a new look.

In this new world connection, Japan may look completely different. Idea continental block is an old idea, its, albeit inconsistently, contradictory, but very persistently developed by the largest German geopolitician Karl Haushofer. And he quite rightly considered the civilizational "arc" "Germany - Russia - Japan" to be promising, reasonably not including China in this "arc" ... The Japanese have in their national character traits similar to those character traits of Russians, Germans and peoples of Islamic East, which was mentioned above, and China is the personified mercantilism and calculation. For China, a good and convenient partner is a fooled partner.

And the

Germans? One simple German, recognizing Russia in captivity, said in the middle of the 20th century: "If to unite a German man and a Russian woman - this will be communism. There is something to think about..."

In the end, nothing can be changed in the past, but from the past you can take lessons. And although we have not yet learned lessons from the past, our the past cannot be useful to us ... The

prehistory, history and posthistory of the First World War gives us good food for reflection...

100 years after the outbreak of the First World War, reflections on it acquire not only relevant, but also quite definite. Become definitive understand all, in fact, aspects and origins of long-standing problems.

Let's take Russia ... In every way, we painted the "dominance" of the "German" ... But by the end XVIII century, throughout the XIX century, and even more so since the beginning of the XX century, the most powerful foreign influence in Russia was not German influence, but, no matter how it may seem strange at first glance, English.

English influence was stronger for two reasons: first, it was secret; secondly, it was well funded from the standpoint of bribing Russian state "top" and feeding "educated" circles - all this liberal professorship like Pavel Milyukov. Let

me remind you that Emperor Paul I is by no means a psychopath, which he usually depict, but a very intelligent person was eliminated in 1801 by the pro-English palace camarilla ... And Paul's life was stopped not so much by a golden snuffbox as by a golden English guinea...

Actually, the pro-English camarilla eliminated Emperor Nicholas in 1917 II, but no longer with a snuffbox in the temple, like Paul, but through the February Revolution.

In Russia, to this day, it is almost unknown that the Russian army, which cleared the Russian land in the Patriotic War of 1812, then moved to Europe, to Paris, not so much Russia's national interests, how much British subsidies. Russian blood ensured the final elimination of the most dangerous rival of England - Napoleonic France. The wars of the highlanders against the

Russians and the adventures of Shamil were also financed by the British ... And much later, Russia was openly drawn into the impending World War I through the Franco-Russian alliance, but covertly through the Russian agents of British influence in all circles of society. Career growth during World War I of the same admiral Kolchak was provided not so much by his talents as by English troubles ...

In Russia, they talked a lot about the alleged "German dominance", but in reality it is semi-mythical dominance not only could not keep Russia from drifting towards the Entente, but did not keep Russia and from the war with Germany. One of the reasons here was the secret, but real English is not

dominance, but influence.

In Germany, the latent influence of the Britons manifested itself weaker, although there, as we know, without there were no Holsteins ... But in Germany there is an extensive secret web that entangled society, was required less acutely - it was easier and more reliable to play the English anti-German party in Russia. No wonder the Russian geopolitician Vandam so correctly caught the ability and inclination of the Anglo-Saxons to approach world politics as a multi-way chess game.

However, it would be wrong to say that England, intriguing against Russia and Germany, proceeded primarily from their own interests. In a book read by a reader Much has been said about this, but I will emphasize again: the leading role in the preparation of the First World War was played not by the interests of English, but by supranational Capital, which the war was needed for many reasons - geopolitical, economic, social ... The main driving contradictions were not the established Anglo-German, but promising American-German ... After all, while maintaining the peaceful development of the global situation Germany bypassed America. And only the world could disrupt such a prospect. war.

Why did England agree to carry chestnuts out of the fire, in fact, for America? Today the answer - if you want to see - is obvious. A new community of world capitals, their supranational community, finally took shape at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, when the system of the world capitalist economy emerged. And most English elite in this period already felt rather part of a new supranational elite Communities than citizens and sons of England ... At the same time, the main rate that has developed to In the 20th century, the Golden International did not work for England, but for America ...

It turned out this way because, on the one hand, England, in the conditions of the emergence of new means armed struggle became vulnerable and available for destruction, in contrast to America... On the other hand, England was in the future, I beg your pardon for the pun, unpromising for the Golden International... Even before the First World

War, it became clear that the classical colonial empires doomed, and the purely national economic potential of England, in contrast to United States, was weak and even poor. Relatively, of course, weak and poor, but ...

It turned out that the new headquarters of the World Supranational Elite should be Washington and New York. At the same time, for the "tops" of the Golden International, it would be simply stupid not to use the centuries-old experience to the full and British connections in terms of secret diplomacy, intrigue, penetration into national elites of other countries...

All this, of course, was used, and the First World War was the result. And then - and the Second ... Speaking

about the causes of the First World War, we must not forget that it allowed the Golden International to slow down the pace of development of the European labor movement, which before the war it began to grow rapidly and to the left, not without the influence

of Lenin. And in the end, the cause of the First World War, as well as the Second World War, as well as in general all large and small wars of the 20th and 21st centuries, was and remains the disgusting, truly cannibalistic greed of the Golden Elite and its unbridled lust ...

THE MODERN world with its fast communications, the World Wide Web, mobile communication, the motley national composition of billionaires, etc. allows you to have the headquarters of the Golden Elite anywhere, even in the Bahamas ... However, everything

has long been established and tied to the States, and the talent for impudence America discovered an outstanding, and by the second half of the 50s, former US Secretary of State Dean Acheson publicly made a disparaging remark about how England, they say, having lost an empire, did not find a new world role for itself. True, in January 1957, Prime Minister

Harold Macmillan exclaimed in response:
"What nonsense! We are a great country and we are not ashamed to say it publicly..."

Some ten years later, another conservative premier, Edward Heath, publicly declared otherwise: Britain finally moved into the category of "middle powers first rank...

But this is - on formal grounds, in reality, the British component Anglo-Saxon world, Pax Saxonica, is consistently strong, including financially. At the end In the 20th century, England owned shares and financial assets abroad worth 730 billion pounds. A quarter of foreign investment in the United States was then British - about 50 billion dollars, and about the same was the volume of American investment in England. Interesting

fact! The ideological influence of the English part of the Golden Elite has always been and remains huge - the experience of centuries is the experience of centuries. But it doesn't really matter anymore - this experience is marked today by the seal of centuries of degeneration ...

The global proprietary Elite is degrading without noticing it, and not wanting to notice it. After all, a rare alcoholic and pervert openly (or at least to himself) admits that he alcoholic and pervert.

However, regarding the latter, I am, of course, old-fashioned wrong. Current The "creative" Elite is corrupted so much that they no longer consider depravity to be depravity, but a hallmark of "chosenness" and "creativity" ...

It is high time for the peoples of the world to get rid of all this, world capitalism has exhausted their creative possibilities by the beginning of the First World War, and this is convincing confirmed the very fact of the war, or rather the massacre. After the war, world capitalism began to turn into a living corpse and by the beginning of the 21st century finally turned into it.

It's time for the dead to finally rest, for his presence in the world infects humanity with deadly miasma...

But the peoples of the world are capable of doing this only under the leadership of a revived socialist Russia. And it is simply necessary - not for the Elite, but for the peoples - that next to strong Russia stood a strong, spiritually reborn, democratic Germany, shaking off the ashes of Americanism. These

are the conclusions that reflections lead to when looking at that old, but still not ended war. Our future is

still cloudy and unclear, but it will not be possible to get away from it ... American Francis Fukuyama had the audacity to announce the "end of history" to us. However, the life of nations should not to have an end - it is, and it must go on and on.

***Kremlev (Arzamas-16) July-
August 1998, February-March 2000, May 2002, July
2002, June 2014***

The main bibliography for the book by Sergei Kremlev "The First world: a new look at the old war"

1. Alexandrov V. On foreign shores: Per. from English. / foreword and general Ed. OK. Shkarenkov. – M.: Progress, 1987
2. Alekseeva I.V. The Agony of Cordial Consent. Tsarism, the bourgeoisie and their allies in Entente. 1914–1917 - L.: Lenizdat, 1990.
3. Ananyich B.V. Banking houses in Russia 1860–1914. Essays on the history of the private entrepreneurship. - L.: Science. Leningrad branch, 1991.
4. Archive of the Russian Revolution. In 22 volumes - M.: Terra-Political Publishing House, 1991
5. Balkan Studies. Issue. 4. Russian-Turkish war 1877-1878 and the Balkans. - M.: Nauka, 1978
6. Balkan studies. Issue. 8. Balkan peoples and European governments in XVIII - early XX century. - M.: Nauka, 1982
7. Barsukov E. Z. Artillery of the Russian army (1900–1917). T. 1–4. - M.: 1948-1949. 8. Bezymensky Lev. Why did Winston Churchill say no? Zh. "New time", No. 33, 1988, p. 34
9. Belkin S. I. Blue ribbon of the Atlantic. – 4th ed., revised. and additional – L.: Shipbuilding, 1990.
10. Belyavskaya I. A. Theodore Roosevelt. - M.: "Nauka", 1978.
11. Bergier J. Industrial espionage. Per. from fr. M., International relations. 1972
12. Bolotov A. T. The life and adventures of Andrei Bolotov: described by him for of their descendants: In 3 volumes, M.: TERRA, 1993
13. Great Soviet Encyclopedia, 1st edition
14. Great Soviet encyclopedia, 2nd edition - M., Soviet encyclopedia.
15. Bonch-Bruevich M. D. All power to the Soviets. Memories. – M.: Military publishing house. 1957.
16. Borisov Yu. V. Charles-Maurice Talleyrand. – M.: Intern. Relations, 1986.
17. Brusilov AA My memories. Ed. 5th. - M.: 1963.
18. Buchanan J. Memoirs of a diplomat. – M.: International. relationship. 1991.
19. Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich: Memoirs. Memoirs. Minsk. Harvest. 2004
20. Vernadsky V. I. Diaries. 1917–1921 - Kyiv. Naukova Dumka, 1994.
21. Wilhelm II. Events and people 1878-1918. Memories. Memoirs. Minsk, Harvest, 2003
22. Witte S. Yu. Memories. In 3 volumes, - M.: Sotsekgiz, 1960
23. Witte S. Yu. Selected memories. - M.: Thought, 1991.
24. Memories of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin: In 5 volumes - M.: Politizdat, 1984
25. Galaktionov M. Paris, 1914 (Pace of operations). - M., LLC "Publishing House AST"; St. Petersburg: Terra Fantastica. 2001.
26. Gerasimov M. N. Awakening. - M.: Military Publishing, 1965.
27. Gereke G. I was a royal Prussian adviser. Memoirs of a political figure. Per. from German, - M.: Progress. 1977.
28. Golovin N. N. Military efforts of Russia in the World War / Conclude. article by IV Obratsov. Zhukovsky; Moscow: Kuchkovo field. 2001., 29. Golovin N. N.: From the history of the 1914 campaign on the Russian front.
30. Goncourt E and Goncourt J. Diary. Notes of literary life. In 2 volumes, Moscow: Fiction, 1964.
31. Davidson AB Cecil Rhodes and his time. - M.: Thought, 1984
32. Danilevsky N. Ya. Russia and Europe / Compiled, afterword and comments by S. A. Vaygachev. M.: Kniga, 1991
33. Danilov Yu. N. Russia in the World War 1914–1915. Berlin, 1924.

34. Debidur A. Diplomatic history of Europe. In 2 volumes, - M., State Foreign Literature Publishing House, 1947 35.
- Denikin AI The Way of a Russian Officer. - M.: Prometheus, 1990 36.
- Joll J. The origins of the First World War / Per. from English, Rostov-on-Don, Phoenix, 1998. 37.
- Dictionary of diplomacy. In 3 volumes, 4th ed., revised. and additional - M.: Nauka, 1985.
38. Diaries of Emperor Nicholas II. Orbit. Moscow branch. 1991. 39. Dongarov AG Foreign capital in Russia and the USSR. - M.: Intern. Relations, 1990. 40. Drabkina E. Ya. Black crackers. - M.: Soviet writer, 1976. 41. Dumova N. G., Trukhanovsky V. G. Churchill and Milyukov against Soviet Russia. - M.: Nauka, 1989. 42. Spirit of Rapallo: Soviet-German relations. 1925-1933 - Ekaterinburg-Moscow: Scientific and educational center "University", 1997. 43. Epanchin N. A. In the service of three emperors. Memories. - M: Magazine edition "Our Heritage", with the participation of the state company "Polygraphresources", 1996. 44. Zaionchkovsky A. M. World War 1914-1918. Ed. 3, vol. 1-3. - M.: 1938. 45. Zdravomyslov AG The Germans about the Russians on the threshold of the new millennium. M, ROSSPEN, 2003
46. Ignatiev A. A. fifty years in the ranks. In 2 volumes. - M.: Pravda, 1989 47. Ignatiev A. V. S. Yu. Witte - a diplomat. - M.: International. relationship. 1989 48. From the literary heritage of academician EV Tarle. - M.: Nauka, 1981. 49. History of diplomacy. In 6 volumes. Ed. 2, revised. And add., - M.: Gospolitizdat, 1959. 50. History of the First World War. 1914-1918 In 2 volumes - M.: Nauka, 1975. 51. History of France. In 3 volumes, vol. - M.: Nauka, 1972 52. Kertman L. E. Joseph Chamberlain and sons. - M.: Thought, 1990. 53. Kokovtsov VN From my past. Memoirs 1911-1919. - M.: Sovremennik, 1991. 54. Kostin B. A. Skobelev. - M.: Patriot, 1990 55. Krasilshchikov A.P. Gliders of the USSR: A Handbook. - M.: Mashinostroenie, 1991. 56. Red Book of the Cheka. In 2 volumes - 2nd ed., clarified. - M.: Politizdat. 1990. 57. Kulikov N. G. I am yours, Russia. - M.: Soviet Russia. 1990 58. Laverychev V. Ya. Military state-monopoly capitalism in Russia. - M.: Nauka, 1988.
59. Lamzdorf V. N. Diary. 1894-1896 / transl. with fr, germ. and English, introduction, compilation and comments by I. A. Dyakonova. - M.: International relations. - 1991
60. Lan V. I. USA: From the First to the Second World War. - M.: Nauka, 1976. 61. Lan V. I. USA in the war and post-war years. - M.: Nauka, 1978. 62. Landsberg F. The rich and the super-rich. About the true rulers of the United States of America. Per. from English. - M.: Progress, 1971. 63. Lenin V. I. Complete works, 5th ed., - M.: Politizdat, 1975 64. Ludwig E. Bismarck. - M.: Zakharov - AST. 1999. 65. Manikovskiy A. A. Combat supply of the Russian army in the world war. Ed. 3. - M.: 1937. 66. Mann T. Letters. - M.: Nauka, 1975 67. Manfred A. Z. Foreign policy of France in 1871-1891. - M.: Ed. Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1952. 68.
- Meyer G. The Last Illusion. American plan for world domination. Abbreviated per. from English. - M.: Publishing house of foreign literature, 1955
69. Milyukov P. N. Memoirs (1859-1917). - M.: Sovremennik, 1990 70. Morua A. The life of Disraeli. - M.: Politizdat. 1991. 71. Muller W. I found my true homeland. Notes of a German General. Per. with him. -

M.: Progress. 1974

72. The day before, 1931–1939. How the World Was Plunged into War: A Brief History in documents, memoirs and comments / Comp. Nick. N. Yakovlev and others - M.: Politizdat, 1991. 73.

Nemirovich-Danchenko V. I. Skobelev. - M.: Military Publishing, 1993 74.

Nehru J. A look at world history. Letters to my daughter from prison ..., trans. from English, in 3 vols. - M.: Progress, 1981. 75.

Nikolaevsky B. I. Secret pages of history. - M.: Publishing house of the humanitarian literature. 1995 76.

New Basmanaya, 19 / Entry. Article by G. Anjaparidze; Comp. N. Bogomolova. - M.: Artist. Lit., 1990. 77. Paleolog

M. Tsarist Russia during the World War. - M.: International. relationship. 1991.

78. Palmer A. Bismarck. / Per. from English. - Smolensk: Rusich, 1997 79. Preparation of Guido Giacomo. Hitler Inc. How Britain and the United States created the Third Reich". Per. from English. A. N. Anvaera. M., "Generation", 2007.

80. Russia and the USA: diplomatic relations. 1900–1917 Ed. acad. A. N. Yakovleva. - M.: MFD, 1999. 81. Sazonov S. D.

Memories. - M.: International. relationship. 1991. 82. Stankevich V. B. Memories. 1914–1919 Lomonosov Yu. V. Memories of

March Revolution of 1917 / Comp., entry. St., note. A. A. Senina - M.: Russian. state humanit. un-t, 1994. 83. Stasov VV Letters

to relatives. In 3 volumes. - M: State Musical publishing house,

1953 84. Sesyuli R. IG Farbenindustry. Per. from English, - M.: State Publishing House foreign literature, 1948. 85. Takman

B. August guns. Per. from English. - M.: Young Guard, 1972. 86. Tarle E. V. Works in 12 volumes. - M.: Publishing house of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1958. 87.

Trotsky L., My life. Autobiographical experience. - M.: Panorama, 1991. 88.

Works on the history of science in Russia / V. I. Vernadsky. - M.: Nauka, 1988 89.

Turgenev IS Complete works and letters in 28 volumes. - M.-L.: Nauka, 1968. 90. Tugendhat K.,

Hamilton A. Oil. The biggest business. Per. from English. - M.: Progress, 1978

91. Utkin A. I. Diplomacy of Woodrow Wilson. - M.: International. relations, 1989 92. "The well-forgotten old" / Sat. articles. - M.: Military publishing house. 1991 93.

Fedorov VG In search of weapons. - M.: Military Publishing House,

1964. 94. Ferenbach O. The collapse and the revival of Germany. A look at European history of the 20th century. - M.:

Agraf, 2001. 95. Fossett P. G. Unfinished Journey / Per. from English. - M.: ARMADA,

1998. 96. Freud Z., Bullitt W. Woodrow Wilson. 28th President of the United States. Psychologist. Research Per. from English. -

M.: Progress, 1992 97. Frish S. E. Through the prism of time. - M.:

Politizdat, 1992. 98. Fuller J. F. S. The Second World War. 1939–1945 Strategic and tactical overview. Per. from English, - M.: Publishing house of foreign literature. 1956.

99. Shatsillo K.F. From the Peace of Portsmouth to the First World War. Generals and policy. - M.: ROSSPEN, 2000.

100. Shaposhnikov B. M ... Memories. Military scientific works. - 2nd ed., add. - M.: Military Publishing,

1982. 101. Shearer W. Rise and Fall of the Third Reich. In 2 volumes. Per. from English. - M.: Military Publishing House, 1991.

102. Shlyapnikov A. G. Eve of the seventeenth year. Seventeenth year. In 3 volumes - M.:

Politizdat, 1992.

103. Chesterton GK Eternal Man: Per. from English. - M.: Politizdat, 1991

104. Erriot E. From the past. Between the two wars 1914–1936. Per. from French, M.: Publishing house of foreign literature, 1958.

105. Yakovlev N. N. August 1, 1914. Third edition, add. – M.: Moskvityanin, 1993.